THE USE AND ABUSE OF CHURCH HISTORY

Class 270,07R Book J421
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
cop. 4

PRESENTED BY
The author

THE USE AND ABUSE OF CHURCH HISTORY

SIX LECTURES

BY

ARTHUR WHIPPLE JENKS, D.D.
Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the
General Theological Seminary,
New York City

EDWIN S. GORHAM, PUBLISHER
NEW YORK
1919

CRANMER LIBRARY

270.07R
J421
cop. 4

68410

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY

DEDICATED TO

LUCIUS WATERMAN

DOCTOR OF DIVINITY

IN RECOGNITION OF HIS FRIENDSHIP AND COUNSEL

DURING A QUARTER OF A CENTURY

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Preface		3
Lecture	I. The Scientific Method	5
	II. Controversy	16
	III. Fallacies	26
	IV. Constructive History	44
	V. Foundation Facts: the Early Church	57
	VI. Foundation Facts: the Anglo-Catholic Church	73
Notes		87

PREFACE

The lectures published herein are the expansion and formulation of four papers prepared and delivered at the Summer School for Clergy in Albany in 1913. They were repeated at the Summer School at Faribault, Minn., under the auspices of the Seabury Divinity School and at the Summer Conference of Church Workers at Cambridge in 1915, and appeared in the American Church Monthly in the years 1917–18. It is hoped that as now printed, with added notes they may be found suggestive.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/useabuseofchurch0000arth

The Use and Abuse of Church History

I. The Scientific Method.

A WAGGISH acquaintance used to delight to say from time to time to the writer of these papers, "My dear friend, there is nothing in the world that can lie like figures, except history." That remark is a terse and unqualified expression of a difficulty that exists in the minds of many people who are really concerned in examining and studying everything that bears upon the religious problems of the day and the various movements towards the restoration of visible Church Unity.

The historian always is confronted with certain difficulties which are inevitable and incapable of removal, but are not readily recognized and admitted as such by the inexpert. The statement of this situation is clearly expressed by two eminent French historians writing on the study of history. "In comparison with students in other departments of learning, the historian finds himself in a particularly difficult position. Not only is it never granted to him to observe directly the facts, as is the case with the investigator in physical science; but it is very rarely that the documents with which he has to work represent precise observations. He has not at his disposal verbal reports of observations scientifically established which in other sciences can and do take the place of precise observations. He is in the situation of a chemist who is acquainted with a series of experiments only through the reports of his laboratory assistant. The historian is forced to make use of reports often very crude with which no student can be content." *

This frank admission by men eminent in the application of the scientific method to history may fittingly prelude the subject

* Introduction aux Etudes Historiques, Langlois et Seignobos, p. 47.

with which we are to deal and serve to win some sympathy for the historian of the Church in his exacting work.

There is genuine perplexity to-day amongst those thoughtful people, not few in number, who feel with propriety that there must be some indisputable facts in regard to the Christian Church. An observant reader, confronted with two statements, exact opposites of one another, sees that only one can be historically true; *e. g.*, that Henry VIII founded the Church of England, or that the Church of England to-day is continuous with the Church in England before the sixteenth century and is catholic and primitive in doctrine, discipline and worship.

Convinced that history will give a clear answer to inquiry on such a question the conscientious student begins a course of reading to discover the historical witness. At the outset a book is recommended as good history which asserts the basal facts to be that St. Paul preached Christianity in Britain, introduced the episcopal organization, and handed on the power and authority of the Christian Ministry. The conclusion reached is that subsequent Christianity in that land may look to St. Paul as its apostolic founder, and consequently is independent of St. Peter. The case against Roman papal claims seems to be strengthened by the assertion that, as Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, received episcopal consecration from Gallican Bishops who traced their succession to Asia Minor, therefore modern Anglican Orders are derived through Augustine from St. John. Perfectly content with this seemingly unassailable answer, the inquirer happens to take up a reputable Church paper and finds in its columns a review which traverses the main contentions of the volume he has recently read, and shows on apparently reliable evidence that its conclusions are utterly untenable, although the critic asserts distinctly the independence of the English Church as against papal claims. Next our seeker after historical truth, now somewhat sceptical on the value of the appeal to history, finds a third plausible narrative from the pen of a convincing Non-conformist writer, who shows that the Church of England began in the sixteenth century and is one of the Protestant sects dating from the Reformation. Later still

another treatment of the subject is brought to our inquirer's attention, this time by a Roman Catholic controversialist. Our reader is puzzled to discover that this last exponent of history agrees with the Non-conformist. The case used as an illustration is not imaginary. It is not difficult to state well-known books on the English Church which take these opposing views and claim alike to be history.[1]

Under such circumstances it is not strange that many conclude that what goes under the description of Church History is undeserving of the name of history and is no more than a manipulation and dressing up of facts to suit the preconception of the individual writer. True, a similar difficulty exists so far as general history is concerned, but not with the same intimate relations to the well-being of souls nor with the same disastrous effect upon later generations.

If the witness of the history of the Church is worth anything — and we feel that it must have some value, many of us a high value — if there is any such witness at all that can be called into court and cross-examined, then it is desirable and necessary that some effort be made to deal with the entirely reasonable perplexity which exists among thoughtful people, and to show how we may get at the witness of history on the problems of Church development. Our present purpose is to set forth some considerations, tests and safeguards, which may aid in the selection and use of treatises on Church History so as to secure positive and definite results.

Before dealing directly with our main subject, it is necessary to speak rather plainly concerning *two styles of historical writing which masquerade under the name of history.* "He that will be a teacher of Ecclesiastical History," remarks the late Prof. Gwatkin, "must lay it to heart that there is neither art nor mystery in the matter beyond the art and mystery of teaching history in general. Ecclesiastical History is not an enchanted ground where the laws of evidence and common sense are left behind, and partisanship may run riot without blame."

Our first warning shall be against writers whose method is what may be called *special pleading*, or "the specious but

unsound and unfair argumentation of one whose aim is victory rather than truth."

"Every religious body," says Bishop Collins in his suggestions for the study of Early Church History, "and every school of thought studies its history with the desire of finding its own doctrinal and disciplinary system there, or at any rate some foreshadowing of it. Accordingly (though there are many fair-minded students of all schools) there is hardly any subject in which rash conjecture has been made to do duty so largely for historical investigation, and in which research has been so coloured and biased by *a priori* assumptions. Be on your guard, therefore, against reading your own opinions into that which you are studying, and against slavishly copying the opinions of others."

Special pleading is a characteristic of pamphlet controversy, courses of polemical lectures, and the "short and easy method" of silencing an opponent. In particular, attention is concentrated on minor points while the more important contentions are ignored or given slight attention. The flaws in an antagonist's argument are noted, and the impression is fostered that his case is no stronger than its weakest point. Generalizations, of a most sweeping kind, are imposed upon the reader, who very likely has not the time nor material for testing them. An unsupported generalization, which, if true, would carry weight, is made the basis for deductions which must fail if the assumption is questionable or false. Rhetorical flights, appeals to the sympathies, any kind of "play to the gallery," are made to pass muster for real historical evidence. Who has not read such passages and felt their tricky and unwarranted force? Innumerable readers have been trapped by Kingsley's Hypatia into a false conception of Cyril of Alexandria and so made to have a sympathy with Nestorius and a prejudice against the action of the Church's great councils; likewise Macaulay's unfair estimate of Archbishop Laud, from the narrow position of one who hated what Laud was contending for, dwelling only upon the personal weaknesses and tactical blunders in certain instances, set forth with all the charm of literary style, has mislead thou-

sands who assume that Macaulay writes history. Any careful and fair-minded reader is capable of detecting this unhistorical method and should be determined to do so.[2]

Closely allied with this style of quasi-historical writing is the mode which may be described as *making out a good case for one's own side.*[3] The plan followed is that of stating fully and strongly all that can be brought forward for a certain position, omitting to mention that any difficulties exist, and giving the impression that practically nothing can be said against it. We are all prone to err in this way. But our own experience should make us suspicious of others who adopt this line of procedure. There is a strong probability that the man who concedes that there are two sides and that his position is not free from difficulties has on the whole so good a case that he can afford to make admissions. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the writer who refuses to state anything which might appear to be against him does so because his case is weak and the other side damaging. But candor is itself convincing and the trustworthy historian of the Church candidly concedes that he is dealing with facts, all of which must be known and interpreted, not a clever selection of a few. "You can no more construct history out of subjective enthusiasms or the pietism of the street corner than you can make bricks without straw."

The elimination of books and pamphlets purporting to be history whose value and trustworthiness are vitiated by one or both of these fallacious methods will result in the exclusion of at least fifty per cent of current historical literature from a list of reliable works in the department of Church History, so glaring and prevalent are these faults.

The most important consideration is *a right historical method.* This is concerned with the evidence, the gathering all that is available, arranging and determining its force, and its interpretation for the purpose of making clear the resultant witness.

The historian need not himself actually engage in the first labor of gathering the evidence. Collection of source material is largely a special department of research at the present time, and fresh material is continually forthcoming. The historian

may commit to others this part of his task, although in many cases he does collect some and test other portions of the historical matter which is to be used. For instance, Bishop Stubbs, one of the greatest of English historians in the nineteenth century, edited the Rolls Series of documents, and Dr. James Gairdner had toiled for many years in the National Archives before he produced any formal historical work. At any rate the ability to do such work is a guarantee of a purpose to use a right method.

The arrangement of evidence and the determination of its value require a high order of skill and a capacity for taking pains. Here is where the historian displays preeminently his training and fitness for the work. Bishop Lightfoot is said to have spent thirty years collecting and arranging the evidence bearing upon the controversy concerning the genuine Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. "He had search made in every part of the known world, wherever any trace of the writings of Ignatius could be found; he examined, either in person or by deputy, every manuscript that was accessible in every library in Europe." Canon Dixon, author of the monumental History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction to the death of Elizabeth, published the first volume in 1877 and had only completed the last volume shortly before his death in 1900. The thoroughness and deliberation thus exemplified guarantee the results to be trustworthy history.

The time has passed, if it ever existed for reputable historians, when the claim is advanced that one can substantiate his position by a single piece of conclusive evidence or a "knock down argument." It is safe to assert that there is no important and essential point in Christian history or doctrine for which such a claim would be found true. Yet in popular estimation one often finds that some such overwhelming and incontrovertible single argument or proof is demanded and a case is adjudged weak and unconvincing which cannot produce such a sledge-hammer fact. Moreover the popular mind will not allow time for a careful and adequate examination of all the evidence on each side. The "proof text method" is discredited amongst serious students, but still employed with great effect by clever and unscru-

pulous popular controversialists. I have had an intelligent and highly educated Mormon missionary tell me that the whole of Mormon doctrine depended on the interpretation on the authority of Joseph Smith of St. Paul's question —" Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead? "[4] And still the passage which Wilfrid thundered out at the Synod at Whitby in 664 as the decisive argument — " Thou art Peter "— is put forward as the conclusive and comprehensive ground for the claims of the modern papacy.

The historian who professes to be using a scientific method in studying the history of the Church will treat the evidence gathered by himself, or for his purposes, as an expert lawyer deals with the material gathered and the witnesses secured for the presentation of his case and will cross-examine whatever is in opposition. He will not neglect details nor refuse to give weight to a witness that has but a minor matter of experience to contribute. And he will not stake nor appear to stake all on a single witness, however important. In the famous first trial in New York of Becker and his associates, the principal witness for the prosecution was made way with before he had appeared in court, and some feared that the case for the State would break down or be dangerously weakened by the loss of the star witness. The prosecution, however, had not depended disproportionately on this testimony, and won the case in spite of the blow which seemed to spell disaster.

The evidence which the ecclesiastical historian has to weigh includes not only every sort that secular historians consider, but others peculiar to his subject, e. g., Christian experience, comparative religion, the laws of the spiritual life and the claim to a supernatural life of the Christian Body. All of these departments are capable of use, none of them may be allowed to outweigh or nullify ordinary historical testimony and none ought to be neglected.

In general the evidence as brought forward by the historian who employs the right method will be found to fall into one or more of the categories,— *complex, cumulative, convergent, corroborative.*

By complex evidence is to be understood the class of statements or facts of which the value and bearing are not immediately or easily made clear. That is to say, the meaning and weight of a document are contingent upon a number of considerations,—the terms employed, the nearness or remoteness of the documents appealed to, the race, age, social, intellectual, and political position of the writer, whether he is hostile and antagonistic, or sympathetic and open-minded. The testimony possesses differing force according as it is given designedly or undesignedly. We may cite one simple illustration. The historian of the early Anglo-Saxon Church, the Venerable Bede, says that Augustine was consecrated to the episcopate by Gallican Bishops. Gregory the Great speaks of Augustine as consecrated by German Bishops. The latter is seen from his writings to have had a defective acquaintance with the geography and people of Western Europe while Bede writes from fuller information and a closer familiarity with the race settlements in the West. The harmonizing of the two statements is simple. The early settlers who replaced the Celts in Gaul were the Teutonic Franks. To Gregory all inhabitants of Frankland or Gaul were Teutons or Germans. To Bede they were Gallicans. Thus both writers are at one on the point in question, viz., that Augustine was consecrated by Bishops holding sees in Frankland, not Italy nor Britain.[5]

Some evidence which at first seems of prime value loses all force under rigid cross-examination. Such an instance is found in the statement of Venantius Fortunatus, who in the sixth century wrote that St. Paul sailed across the ocean to the island which the Briton inhabits. The writer adduces no authorities for his assertion and his date is too far removed from that of St. Paul to allow any weight to his unsupported word. The reader, with ordinary precaution, will learn how to detect what is of positive force in complex evidence.

Cumulative evidence is the stronghold of the painstaking student of history. Little by little he marshals and arranges whatever bears upon his subject. He is not satisfied with one or two strong points in its favor, nor scornful of seemingly

minor matters in opposition. He heaps up the evidence on both sides and the resultant weight turns the balance in one direction or the other. Here is the distinguishing feature between solidly building up a case and inflating a few pieces of evidence in order to appear to make out a case. In illustration of the cumulative method, the incident of the Consecration of Archbishop Parker may be profitably cited for examination. There are several apparently telling facts or allegations against the claim to a due and proper record of Parker's elevation to the episcopate. The Nag's Head fable, of course, as every one now knows, is admittedly without the slightest foundation. Little by little the adverse testimony disappears. On the other hand stands a mass of evidence of many kinds, records in Parker's and other episcopal registers, State papers bearing directly and indirectly on the matter, notices in the college annals of Cambridge, the diary of a layman present at the ceremony, made public long after, and entries in Parker's own diary. No one of these by itself would be conclusive against allegations to the contrary, but taken with their cumulative force they leave the matter of due and proper order incontrovertible.[6]

Evidence which is not explicit on a subject under examination will often be found to have weight because of its convergent force. Without actually and definitely arriving at the point, nevertheless it can be shown to be aimed in that direction and not in any other. If we had fuller information, it is possible that such evidence would become positive and complete. In the absence of all the facts it is not safe to assert that such a line would really lead to the end. When, however, a number of these lines are found, all converging towards a given point, we may with some security conclude that they strengthen the case. Of such a nature are the cases of St. James of Jerusalem, Timothy of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete, in reference to the question of the early development of a localized officer possessing the fullest ministerial powers in the Church of the first century. Most certainly we cannot *prove* diocesan episcopacy from one or all of these three instances, but all look quite decidedly in that direction and the settled territorial organization appearing later

satisfies the tendency of all these lines as no other theory does so well. Obviously there will be divergent lines of evidence. If these tend in the same opposing direction, they weigh against a theory. If the divergent lines run off in several directions, they fail to affect the positive contention in a serious way. Obviously, too, there will always be present facts or statements which make neither for nor against a particular hypothesis, but may be twisted by a clever opponent so as to seem to be on his side. The argument from silence is capable of being used or abused because it is generally indeterminate unless we possess some clue to the reason for the silence.[7]

Corroborative evidence is of high importance. This species of testimony includes the substantiation or independent setting forth of facts and details, from other sources than writings of the historian himself whose trustworthiness has been challenged or doubted. If by means of corroborative evidence we are able to show the accuracy of a writer in relation to a considerable variety of points where a careless person might assume that no one would be likely to follow up and investigate his statements, it is safe to trust the same historian on matters which cannot be tested now and to accept his work as authoritative. The trustworthiness of the writer of the Book of the Acts has been established beyond reasonable doubt by investigators who have brought archaeology, geography, secular history, and other departments of research to bear upon even microscopic details of the narrative. The studies of Dr. W. M. Ramsay, such as "St. Paul the Traveller," "The Historical Geography of Asia Minor," and "The Church in the Roman Empire," are largely of the nature of investigations to gather corroborative evidence. Much of the value of certain portions of the historical writings of Eusebius also lies in his having at his command sources which corroborate the statements and narratives contained in the New Testament or in other documents. Thus the critical matters of history receive enormous strengthening by such minute examination and testing while doubtful points are exposed. No writer should be followed as an authority who does not, by reference to sources, afford signs that he himself has endeavored to establish

the accuracy of his information. In general, foot-notes and bibliographies indicate that an author has sought full support for his contentions.[8]

In the interpretation of the evidence and the drawing of general conclusions the true historical ability appears. Historians really great are judicial and conservative in stating the results of their study and thought. Pseudo-historians are likely to be cocksure in their style of assertion. The reader who is only seeking to have his own position sustained, and has not an open mind to take in and weigh dispassionately the whole case, likes cocksureness and often estimates the worth of a historian by this quality or its absence. Bishop Stubbs, as readers sometimes feel, is ultra-conservative, at times exasperatingly so. Macaulay, on the other hand, is downright, unqualified, prejudiced, yet is popular to a considerable extent just on that account. The correlation of evidence and facts in such wise as to make them all fit into right relationships to the main subject and to one another is a most subtle part of the historian's equipment. This is markedly the case with the historian of the Church, who has to correlate the events of the Church's life and development with the supernatural truths which it holds as its charter and which are claimed as unique and essential. Even non-Christian historians, such as Gibbon, cannot avoid taking into account the correlation of creed with conduct.

The subject of the true process in writing the history of the Christian Church is capable of much fuller treatment and illustration. Enough has been said, however, to indicate the main lines for guidance in the selection of books on Church History, and to afford means for testing conclusions which profess to be reached by a scientific historical method.

II. Controversy.

"CONTROVERSY," says Dr. Mason, in his preface to The Faith of the Gospel, "is a form of Apologetics in which the opponent, instead of standing outside the Faith altogether, claims to be the true representative of it." Dr. Mason goes on to say that he "is not much disposed to believe in controversy as a means of producing agreement, and inclines to think that the positive statement of belief acts much more convincingly upon honest divergence than any amount of negative criticism."

"It is the entire want of a knowledge of Church History which causes so much needless or useless controversy," said Hugh James Rose writing in the early days of the Oxford Movement, and he adds, "It is the entire absence of all knowledge of the necessity for it (viz., the study of Church History), which makes controversy constantly so disgusting."

Controversy is not history. It is the attempt to establish or to disprove a given historical thesis by a one-sided use of historical facts. True history is not the controversial study of facts. The great historians from the day of the writer of the Acts of the Apostles down to the present time have not been controversialists. Yet it is safe to assert that such acquaintance with Church History as is possessed by the majority of people to-day has been derived from controversial lectures, polemical books and the correspondence columns of Church and secular papers and magazines.

Controversy in matters of doctrine, discipline and worship has been a phenomenon throughout the history of Christianity, beginning in apostolic times with the positions advanced by the judaizing party which lead up to the Council at Jerusalem. It is wellnigh impossible to point out any period in the Christian centuries when the whole or a large section of the Church has not been occupied with the controversial discussion of some

article or aspect of revealed truth. The fact of the presence and recurrence of such polemical considerations of truth is not due to the imperfection of the divine revelation, nor necessitated because the content of revelation is purposely vague and indefinite, nor because truth changes, so that what is true in one generation may turn out at a later age to be untrue. The explanation is to be found in ourselves, *i. e.*, the human factor, at once the recipient of the revelation and also the instrument whereby the revelation is clothed with words so as to be capable of communication and transmission. The recipients are a race made up of innumerable individuals who from a catastrophe which occurred far back in its early history, called in theological language the Fall, have inherited a wounded intellect and hence apprehend imperfectly the Revelation made. The instrument, human language, is inadequate to exact expression of truths outside human experience, but adequate to convey the essential truth as fact issuing in action.

Both of these difficulties, however, have been provided for by the wisdom and plan of Almighty God. The Catholic Church, which makes a new people, the children of God, and gives life and power for healing the wounds and deformities of human nature, acts in its corporate functions to obviate the first of these difficulties, and the Holy Ghost, Who dwells within the Church for the purpose of guiding into the apprehension and expression of revealed truth, also employs human language as a medium for conveying that truth and for making it the basis of action and life which is the final purpose of revelation.

This much is put forward to suggest that controversy up to a certain point indicated by the etymology of the term, the stating or putting over against one another of different human aspects of a matter, is not necessarily mischievous, but may be positively beneficial. St. Paul used that method in the Epistle to the Romans. It is the familiar style of the Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas. Unfortunately what is generally understood and meant by the term — controversy — does not end with such judicial statements and attitudes towards the subjects in question.

If controversy is to be minimized so far as prevalence is concerned, and mitigated so far as animosity is concerned, certain points need to be borne in mind and a few practical methods adopted which will tend in some measure to eliminate the more deplorable features of theological discussion.

I. *The Sources of Historical Controversy in the Church.*

How do controversies arise? What is the nature of the starting-point? The notable controversies in Christian history have appeared very much as a thunderstorm arises in the summer time. It comes rushing down upon us, in full force, when we have just begun to realize that the electric-charged atmosphere is very likely to produce some such a disturbance.[1] The following sources are inductions from many controversies recorded in the history of the Church.

(1) *The taking of some principle out of its true relationship and giving it an absolute value, or a fictitious importance.*

A good example of this is found in the common mistake of confusing what belongs respectively to doctrine, to discipline and to worship. Here are three closely related departments of Church life, and in each department are contained matters of importance, which yet have to be distinguished as to their relative and essential value. We may illustrate from the frequently recurring vestiarian controversies. In the Elizabethan period the controversy turned on the use of at least a surplice by the clergy when officiating. In the middle of the 19th century the well-known riots in London were over the use of a surplice by the preacher in the pulpit. In days which some of us remember the colored stole was the issue, in still more recent days the use of the Eucharistic vestments. While far in the background of the earliest Christian times lies that which is, to use the language of a great Christian archaeologist, "matter of general knowledge among scholars" that the vestments of the clergy "are simply the adaptation to religious use of the ordinary dress of civil, and particularly of official, life in the Roman Empire." In other words the question of the dress of the clergy, so far as the details are concerned, belongs to the

Church's discipline, while the great doctrinal principle that the clergy of the Church are not acting merely in their human capacity when engaged in their ministrations, but as representatives of the "Apostle and High Priest of our profession" may be emphasized as strongly by the simple but characteristic uniform of the surplice. It is the principle of official character which is important. We confuse the issue when we elevate discipline into doctrine, or neglect to give doctrine the foremost place. The doctrine of the Church has always been that her priests have official character. The discipline of the Church has provided that this shall be indicated by a distinctive uniform, but that uniform is capable of variation and should not be allowed to have such an absolute or false importance as to obscure or confuse the underlying truth.[2]

Or we may take the contention against the marriage of the clergy. Whatever controversy there has been, and in the eleventh century it was bitter, has come from removing the matter quite out of its place relatively as discipline for certain times and circumstances, and in the case of vowed celibacy a special vocation, and elevating the non-marriage of the clergy to a position where it is almost held equal to doctrine necessary to salvation.[3]

Let me give an illustration of another kind. It may be just as fruitful a source of controversy to select a certain period in the history of the Church or a group of theological writers as an arbitrary test or standard. The "Caroline Divines" are such a group and it is not very long ago that a local Church newspaper controversy waxed hot and furious over their witness to or against sacramental Confession. Of course the fallacy lies in assuming that any one group or period infallibly and explicitly represents and states the whole Faith and practice of the Church in all possible applications.[4]

(2) *The misunderstanding of some truth, or of some presentation of that truth, is a fruitful source of controversy.*

An excellent illustration of this is continually found in the misunderstanding of the Church's doctrine of the Ministry and

Apostolic Succession. "You can't find your doctrine of Episcopacy in the Bible," said a Lutheran pastor to me a short time ago. "Of course I cannot, and I don't claim to," was my reply. "It is the Church that teaches it, and the New Testament is one of the witnesses and the greatest witness to the principle and truth." After that the matter for controversy was lacking. He said he had never thought to work out the subject in that way.[5]

The subject of the Atonement probably in all ages has been the starting-point of most bitter and violent dispute. This is often due to the assumption that a particular theory, e. g., that of Calvin, is authoritative, or because the truth of the Atonement, simply asserted, has not been set forth.

Illustrations under this head will occur to many from their own experience. The simple rule is to endeavor to find out wherein lies the misunderstanding.[6]

(3) *A Mistaking of Means for Ends.*

In all controversies on the Ministry, the Sacraments, the Church, when we wonder wherein lies the obstacle to mutual comprehension it is well to inquire whether one party or the other is not acting on the assumption that these are *goals,* rather than a *road* and *strength* for traveling that road in order to reach the real goal which is Eternal Life, Christian Perfection. It is quite certain that much of the language used on both sides gives color to the charge that Apostolic Succession assures everything beyond possibility of loss, that to be in the true Church amounts almost to the same thing as Calvinistic Election, and to be a communicant is a sign of perfection. One misunderstanding is that a man who goes to confession must be very bad, while the opposite is that one who goes to confession must be very good. The truth, as we all know but do not always make clear, is that the Sacrament of Reconciliation is not an end, but a new beginning, for the bad to be made good and the good made better.[7]

A little less priggishness and a little more humility on the

part of those who use the Means of Grace will make clear to others wherein the real purpose and value of them lie.

(4) *The human frailty of defending one's own mistakes.*

Arius would not correct his erroneous premises. Nestorius, having said something specious and clever—"I will never call a child three months old GOD"—would not take back the remark, but proceeded in the effort to justify his words. Probably the majority of the greater controversies that have raged persisted because some one obstinately refused to correct an error early in the discussion and simply went on from stage to stage preferring to base his contentions on a false assumption, rather than to back down and begin again on a basis of accuracy.[8] In spite of all the books written to expose the falsity of the Nag's Head fable, Roman controversial writings cannot keep from impugning the Consecration of Archbishop Parker as though the fable might be true. In such cases there must be a resolute refusal to carry the discussion further until such factors as come from the error are exposed and eliminated.

II. *Why controversies are endless.*

Scarcely an instance can be adduced of a controversy which has reached a settlement on the merits of the case, and not by something analogous to the usual termination in Church papers—"The editor begs to state that the discussion of this question in these columns is now ended."

We venture to suggest some reasons for this endlessness of controversy.

(1) Because for the most part *there is no real search for the truth, but both parties are occupied in confuting one another.* In the earlier days of the Roman controversy in the nineteenth century, appeared a book entitled, "The End of Controversy," which was shortly answered by a second treatise entitled, "The End of Controversy controverted." Cardinal Gibbons wrote a book called—"The Faith of our Fathers"—and was met by a rejoinder under the title—"The Faith of our Forefathers."

The Temple Church in London in the 17th century presented the scene each Sunday morning of Richard Hooker elaborately and powerfully answering the objections of puritanism to the practices of the Church, while Travers in the afternoon would bring forward fresh objections and try to confute the case as presented earlier in the day. We may regret that, while Hooker gave us a classic in his laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, a treatise never superseded for usefulness in regard to the similar recurring attacks, he did not leave us a positive and constructive treatise which would be dissociated from contemporaneous disputations.[9]

Sincerity in raising questions and honesty in dealing with them will go far towards diminishing these endless bickerings.

(2) Because *the parties in controversy progress after the manner of parallel lines* which can never meet, or only when extended to infinity.

The reason for this is that so frequently there has been no common ground of definition to start with, so that both sides are using the same terms in different senses. Such a state of things is hopeless. You and I may be employing the term "catholic" in its early historical sense connoting orthodoxy and inexhaustible adaptability. Our disputant may have in mind only the former, or he may give it the sense of universal, or use it as equivalent to papal. It is evident that when such a key word occurs with divergent significations the longer the discussion goes on the wider the severance becomes until the possibility of coming together hardly exists.[10] So likewise with the term "protestant." Or again, "Episcopacy" may be employed to denote merely a polity, or in its full historical sense to connote the channel of transmission of ministerial powers and the expression of corporate authority.[11] Again, I suppose a great deal of real difficulty has been caused by some assuming that the explanation of the word "sacrament" in the Prayer Book Catechism was formulated to include all the rites to which the term is theologically applicable rather than the two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, treated of in the Catechism.[12]

What is requisite in such cases is at least a "working definition" even though it may not be altogether satisfactory to either party. The main necessity is some common ground on which to base the discussion of the matter at issue.

(3) *Because the source of the divergence often lies much deeper than is supposed.*

Christianity being the religion of the Incarnation it will not be strange if all controversies are found to lead back eventually to that centre — the Word-made-flesh. The Incarnation is a many-sided truth and the failure to grasp or accept any side may lead to the distortion or misapprehension of related truths. The controversy on miracles really leads back inevitably to the issues involved in the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of Christ. The controversies on Sacraments go back ultimately to the question whether the Life of the Son of God can be transmitted through material channels so that Sacraments are an extension of the Incarnation. All the bitter discussions on worship go down to the fundamental question whether Jesus is God and so adorable and to be adored.[13]

The subject of Authority in religion very often lies behind controversies in which the term itself does not appear. This is particularly true in discussions relative to the Church, which lead back eventually to that aspect of the Church whereby, as "Spirit bearing Body", it is the medium through which the Holy Ghost expresses the truth revealed in Christ. Corporate as against individual authority is the rock on which men split again and again, and that must be discovered if we are to understand wherein lies the real disagreement.[14]

One section of the Christian bodies in separation from the historic Church split off on the point of authority, another section diverged on points connected with the Incarnation, a third because of erroneous views as to man, and so on. The root errors are not many, but we must search until we discover them.[15]

(4) *Because there is no agreement in the interpretation of the common sources on which the controversialists depend.*

All serious consideration of essential points must at last revert to the fundamental positions and the authorities which are the common property of all alike. But then if the methods used in dealing with authorities differ of course the results will differ also. The meaning of language in its historical setting and the same words taken from their context and treated as detached utterances can never lead to a conclusion of the matter at issue. The Bible may be used by one disputant as a witness, another employs the proof-text method, a third seeks only for evidence on his side, while a fourth uses the most scholarly method of getting at the meaning of words but misses the point that certain words early had a fixed Christian sense attached to them.[16]

Luther and Calvin went to St. Augustine of Hippo as an authority and developed radically different systems for which they appealed to the writings of the great Western Doctor, but neither of them took all his writings and used them in conjunction with the fact that Augustine was a Bishop of the Catholic Church, using the Church's sacramental system and Creeds in full.[17]

(5) *Because the methods usually employed in controversy cannot lead to a settlement.*

The exhibition of a *catena,* or chain of authorities, is a common method of procedure. One party will produce quotations from writers covering a wide period to show that the practice of confession has been discouraged or forbidden in one part of the Church, only to call forth a list of authorities on the other side to show that confession has been practiced and encouraged. You can get a *catena* of authorities for or against almost any proposition. Of course such lists of quotations have their value, but this method cannot well be conclusive.[18]

Again, there is often a failure to observe scientific and historical methods, and as the dispute continues the controversialists appeal to prejudice and personalities, and employ subterfuges until the affair becomes an unhappy exhibition of quali-

ties which are a credit to neither side. This is liable to be the case in controversies on the Roman Catholic claims where invective and taunt and villifying frequently take the place of sober, fair consideration of issues.[19]

Controversy is generally carried on in an academic way, as though, after all, the propositions in dispute stood detached from every thing else. Now for us, at least, that cannot be true. Our Creeds fail ultimately with the denial of any one article. The Creed is a whole, not a collection of isolated or loosely related truths. We must not allow such a disputatious principle as will start with a quasi-assent to a statement that any one article may be treated as an open question. And the same is true of all departments of thought based upon the Creeds. All moral and social questions have to be considered by starting with the underlying truths of divine revelation. Good, and right and wrong, and duty towards one's neighbor must not be treated as abstract questions, but as bound up with God's revelations of Himself, His Will, and man's love for Him.[20]

One consideration should be weighed carefully in connection with our subject. Controversy is generally concerned with points especially open to attack. In other words the object is to show the weakness of another's position. One inevitable result is to suggest to people the weak points and the difficulties of the Christian position and to leave them as ignorant as ever of the impregnable and solidly built fabric of the Faith. You may attack the protestantism or the papalism of our day as strongly as you can and even put your antagonist to controversial flight, and yet leave your own people as ignorant as ever of the constructive, positive worth and meaning of the Faith once for all delivered to the saints.[21]

If we have to enter controversy, let us endeavor to avoid some of the pitfalls which have been suggested, but let nothing ever interfere with the continual, patient teaching and exposition of truth as a mighty edifice where all can find security, open to the bluster of the wind and storm, but never capable of being undermined and leveled. Not controversial subtleties but well founded convictions are the strength of the Church against her foes.

III. Fallacies.

THE *bête noire* of the teacher who is endeavoring to deal constructively with the history of the Church generally appears in the form of some popular misunderstanding or mis-statement on the subject under discussion. Back of it lies an obsession, prejudice or assumption, utterly untenable historically, yet obstinately if not fanatically maintained. The difficulty of dealing with such obstacles lies in the fact that the process is very like tilting at windmills. After a careful, candid and fair-minded examination of the point which has been raised, back comes the original assertion, making all effort seem to have been in vain. To use an example which has a saddening familiarity, when the continuity of the Church of England with the Church of the earliest Christian centuries and her independence of other portions is being considered and just as the evidence is being summed up some one is sure to blurt out — "But the English Church *was* founded by Henry VIII. and *all the school text-books say so.*" Such positions come under the meaning of the term, fallacy, and it is the purpose of this chapter to deal with *fallacies as a fruitful source of the abuse of Church History.*

At the outset it is worth while to weigh well the explanation of the term — fallacy — which is given in the Century Dictionary as based upon Sidgwick's treatment of the same word in reference to logic. "A fallacy is used to mean: (1) a piece of false reasoning, in the narrower sense; either an invalid immediate inference, or an invalid syllogism; a supposed equivalent form which is not equivalent, or a syllogism which breaks one of the rules; (2) a piece of false reasoning in the wider sense; whereby *from true facts a false conclusion is inferred;* (3) a false belief, whether *due to correct reasoning from untrue premises* or to *incorrect reasoning from true ones;* (4) *any mental confusion whatever.*" Alas! all forms of fallacy are rife and have to be

exposed on even the most elementary positions as to the Church, its nature and history.

We find a good deal of amusement in the delightful humor of such writers as Lewis Carroll but seem unaware that the transparent tricks of language and reasoning which lead to such absurd conclusions can be shown quite easily to be paralleled in matters of grave importance.

Not with any intention of making light of serious matters but merely to put oneself in a wholesome frame of mind by having a good-natured laugh, the following examples of fallacious method are quoted, the first from *Alice in Wonderland,* the second from a controversial work on the origins of the British Church.

In the trial of the Knave occurs this satire on the force and nature of evidence.*

" There's more evidence to come yet, please your Majesty," said the White Rabbit, jumping up in a great hurry; " this paper has just been picked up."

" What's in it? " said the Queen.

" I haven't opened it yet," said the White Rabbit, " but it seems to be a letter, written by the prisoner to — to somebody."

" It must have been that," said the King, " unless it was written to nobody, which isn't usual, you know." (4)

" Who is it directed to? " said one of the jurymen.

" It isn't directed at all," said the White Rabbit; " in fact, there's nothing written on the *outside.*" He unfolded the paper as he spoke, and added, " It isn't a letter after all, it's a set of verses."

"Are they in the prisoner's handwriting? " asked another of the jurymen.

" No, they're not," said the White Rabbit, " and that's the queerest thing about it." (1) (The jury all looked puzzled.)

" He must have imitated somebody else's hand," said the King. (The jury all brightened up again.)

" Please your Majesty," said the Knave, " I didn't write it, and they can't prove I did; there's no name signed at the end."

* Figures refer to foregoing definition.

"If you didn't sign it," said the King, "that only makes the matter worse. You *must* have meant some mischief, or else you'd have signed your name like an honest man." (1)

There was a general clapping of hands at this; it was the first real clever thing the King had said that day.

"That *proves* his guilt," said the Queen. (3)

The passage just given when carefully examined exhibits two or three common fallacious methods, the perversion of the argument from silence, the assumption of premises which cannot be shown to be true but which are not allowed to be examined, and the all too familiar *non sequitur* at the end, "that proves his guilt."

Incredible as the next instance we give may seem it is quoted and vouched for by a careful historical scholar and antiquary, the Rt. Rev. G. F. Browne, Bishop of Bristol, a well-known writer on the early history of Christianity in England. The passage is a note on page 40 of the writer's volume, "The Christian Church in these Islands before Augustine."

"St. Peter is now claimed as one of the Apostles of Britain; but it is impossible to deal seriously with such a proposition. A pamphlet with this view was issued in 1893, by the Reverend W. Fleming. Cardinal Baronius, holding the view that St. Peter lived long in Rome, felt the difficulty which any one with the historic sense must feel, that St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans makes no mention of St. Peter as being then in Rome, nor does the history in the last chapter of the Acts. The explanation is given that St. Peter, though permanently resident in Rome, was away from home on these occasions. As there is no trace of him in any known country at the time, Britain is taken as the place of his sojourn during some of the later years of St. Paul, probably as the country where traces of his sojourn were least likely to be found on record. Mr. Fleming quotes a passage from a book written in 1609, by the second 'Vicar Apostolic of England and Scotland,' which is only too typical an example of a style of assertion and argument of which we might have hoped that we had seen the last: 'I assure the indifferent reader that St. Peter's preaching to the ancient Britons, on the

one side is affirmed both by Latins and Greeks, by ancient and modern, by foreign and domestic, by Catholic writers, by Protestant antiquaries; and on the other side *denied by no one ancient writer, Greek* or *Latin, foreign* or *domestic, Catholic or other.*' " [A vicious perversion of the argument from silence.]

There is not very much difference between the evidence gathered by the King of hearts and the naive champion of the Petrine claims except that the former is more clever and the latter counts upon an audience that loves to be hoodwinked.

In this chapter we propose to deal with some of the more common fallacies and fallacious methods with which the effort to teach Church History constructively is confronted again and again. It is an undoubted duty to pause and explain carefully the misunderstanding which underlies each particular fallacy but one is made to envy the method of Abraham Lincoln, to which the innumerable stories ascribed to him bear witness, of meeting dilemmas in even grave and critical matters by gently humorous incidents out of a real or imaginary experience. And sometimes the best method seems to be that ascribed to an old-fashioned " high and dry " rector of a New England parish who on Christmas Day preached at considerable length on the various objections made to the observance of the day, e. g. that it was popish, tended to mariolatry, was based upon the untenable position that we know the Nativity to have taken place on December 25, that the tendency of the festival was to make Christianity too joyful, and so on. After some forty minutes of exploiting such arguments the preacher continued —"And now in reply to all this what have we to say? *Who cares?* " and ended the sermon. Unfortunately for the historian, however, it is impossible to count upon his auditors or readers all having a saving sense of humor.

In these lectures emphasis has been laid upon the proper use of authorities and sources as the basis for constructing history. It is now necessary to lay stress upon a prevalent abuse of Church History which consists in the *fallacious method of dealing with authorities and sources.*

It is humiliating to confess that even in the very high places the

indefensible habit is detected of *making no examination or first-hand use of sources.*" The *ipse dixit* which attaches itself as conclusive to the assertions of a writer who for one reason or another has been accepted as practically infallible continually disturbs the scientific treatment of authorities and sources which carefully weighs the method by which a conclusion has been reached, the documents and other evidence on which it is based and the exact language used on the point under discussion. To pin one's faith to a certain writer because his general position is the same as ours or because he seems to get the better of our opponent in some particular instance is to run a risk. Because St. Paul is supposed to be anti-ceremonial or anti-ritual in the passage—"The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life," and so is quoted approvingly by one who objects to Christian ordinances such as the sacraments, and Christian discipline such as fasting, is his teaching as willingly followed on such subjects as the Resurrection and the indissolubility of the marriage bond, or is any real investigation made to discover what the Apostle did mean when he deprecated the letter in favor of the spirit? The sect of Methodists that call themselves "perfectionists" are ready to base their position on St. John's words—"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." But are they equally willing to take the witness and words of the same writer on other parts of Christian revelation? S. Augustine has been taken as the authority for justification by Luther and of predestination by Calvin while neither of them apparently made any attempt to correlate his writings on these subjects with his theology of the Church and her ordinances. The fallacy in all this lies in not examining closely to see what the general position of the writer is and to discover whether the meaning ascribed to a passage is its real and full meaning. "Hooker is my authority," says some one who has come upon the passage which seems to admit the validity of the ministry of Sacraments by non-episcopally ordained clergy. The same individual in all probability would not be equally willing to accept Hooker's theology of the Church, its authority and

discipline which goes far to clear up the meaning of the statement as to the ministry of separated bodies, and which is to be considered in connection with the antagonism to "disciplinarian puritanism" that called forth the Ecclesiastical Polity.[1]

The failure to examine authorities and sources also makes it possible to become an easy victim to translations of passages which are incomplete, inaccurate from the prejudice of the translator, or represent only one side of the meaning of the original. There is a well-known and scholarly historian of our day who has written much that is of great value on the history of the Church. He is possessed, however, with strong and bitter hostility towards certain subjects, viz. the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, the Oxford Movement and its leaders (particularly Newman) and the Sacrament of Absolution. He will go far out of his way to attack any of these, often quite inconsistently with other positions which he holds. As a consequence of such bias his translation of certain passages and his selection of passages for quotation need to be supplemented by an examination of text and context in order to avoid a trap into which the careless or too trustful reader might easily fall.

Even the most accomplished scholar needs to be safeguarded by the works of others. We cannot achieve much in the way of a real examination of the witness of history with one who swears by Macaulay with his brilliant literary style but bitter prejudices, or Froude with his "chronic inaccuracy" which has been characterized in general as "Froude's disease." Still less can the approved historical method be employed with one who like Cardinal Manning takes his stand against all appeal to history on religious questions and claims.* Valuable works like the Catholic Encyclopedia must be used with caution because on cer-

* "It was the charge of the Reformers that the Catholic doctrines were not primitive and their pretension was to revert to antiquity. But *the appeal to antiquity is both a treason and a heresy.* It is a treason because it rejects the Divine voice of the Church at the hour, and a heresy because it denies that voice to be Divine. How can we know what antiquity was except through the Church? No individual, no number of individuals can go back through eighteen hundred years to reach the doctrine of antiquity. . . . No individual mind now has contact with the revelation of Pentecost except through the Church. Historical evidence and biblical criticism are human after all, and amount at most to no more than opinion, probability, human judgment, human tradition."— (The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, page 227.)

tain controversial points writers feel bound to "make out a case."

That we have to be on our guard continually may be forcibly illustrated by an instance which occurs in the latest of encyclopedias on theological subjects, the *Dictionnaire de Theologie Dogmatique* in the article, "*Conciles,*" on the nature and authority of Ecumenical Councils. In this article the following definition is given:

"An ecumenical or universal Council is the solemn assembly of the Bishops of the whole world gathered at the call and under the presidency of the Roman pontiff, to deliberate and legislate in common on matters which are of concern to Christendom. . . . To the Pope and to him to the exclusion of all other authority, ecclesiastical or secular, appertains properly and in itself the right to convoke an ecumenical Council."

This is of course a perfectly familiar position taken in order to uphold the modern claims of the Roman pontiff, but it needs to be tested by history to see if it is borne out by events previous to the critical eleventh century. The writer of the article in the *Dictionnaire* evidently anticipates that his definition will be challenged by historians in a way dangerous to the definition. Accordingly he quite frankly avows that *his definition is framed to meet, not the historical witness, but the theory of the sovereignty of the Bishop of Rome.* The article accordingly proceeds in most naive fashion:

"To suppose as some writers do that the Bishops once assembled in sufficient numbers possess by that fact itself, or received immediately from the Holy Spirit, the character of ecumenicity, would be *to hazard an hypothesis which seems to put the dogma of the primacy in peril;* for this is to introduce in the Church, beside and apart from the Pope, a second form of supreme power. . . . This (the foregoing definition) *cannot be denied without denying also the primacy of the sovereign pontiff.* . . . But (adds the writer significantly) *we seek in vain a positive argument of this nature in the history of the first eight universal councils. Nay, more, nearly all the documents agree in representing them as convoked by the Emperors.*"

What is one to think of so glaring an instance of fallacious use of sources embedded in so scholarly a work? The writer is really taking the ground that the theory according to which a position is built up must be maintained at any cost, and if the facts do not square with the theory, so much the worse for the facts. Evidently if this great dictionary is to be used the method of arriving at conclusions must be most critically scanned. If this be true in the case of writers of the first rank it behooves the student to test all works professing to give the witness of history.

The historian who is not merely an annalist is not infrequently called upon to resist temptations of one kind or another in the use and interpretation of the material which has been accumulated. Facts may be juggled with so cleverly as to make them appear to have relationships which do not exist, magnitude which is telescopic or microscopic but not real nor absolute, significance only to the prejudiced or the ignorant. The correlation of facts is a delicate and subtle process. Of that process something has been said in an earlier chapter. At this particular point a special danger comes forward for consideration, viz., *the abuse of isolated historical facts* in constructive history.*

By an isolated fact is to be understood one not of a series of similar events or acts occurring, if not consecutively, at least with reasonable nearness to one another so that the witnesses who knew of one would know of several, but a fact that stands in its own period or relationship quite without parallel. Certain facts necessarily unique are not in question, e. g. the Virgin Birth, the Election of Matthias, the Day of Pentecost, though indeed all of these have been abused by endeavoring to make each of them one of a series. For example one recalls impugners of the Virgin Birth who argue that other religions claim the same origin for their founders, and one hears emotional petitions in time of a revival or a Mission for a "second Pentecost."

---

* cf. An admirable tract by Rev. T. A. Lacey in the series issued by the Church Historical Society.

There is another class of facts, not necessarily impossible of repetition nor incapable of recurrence, but including isolated events which actually have not been duplicated or which, if apparently recurring, do so at such irregular intervals and under such varying circumstances as to preclude any legitimate relationship between them so as to form a series. These are isolated facts, known to the historical investigator as having really occurred, though detached from the course of historical development in such manner as to require great caution in using them at all. The searcher for historical data will include such facts in his annals, but the historian, properly so called, who uses facts and acts as evidence to establish principles or general laws, is called upon to proceed with the utmost self-restraint lest he magnify their importance or give them a fictitious value.

To give an example of such an isolated fact and an inadmissible use of it will help to make the fallacy clear. We may take the oft produced and much discussed matter of the "Alexandrian Ordinations." A tenth century writer gives an account of the filling of the Patriarchal office in Alexandria which seems to imply that one of twelve presbyters was selected and constituted Patriarch by the laying-on-of-hands and the benediction of the other eleven and that this continued until forbidden by the Patriarch Alexandria in A. D. 325; and that during the first ten of such patriarchates there were no other Bishops in Egypt. St. Jerome, writing in the fifth century gives substantially the same account *except that he makes no mention of the ordination as performed by the eleven presbyters.* This case has been brought forward again and again as indicating that the important Church of Alexandria recognized presbyterian ordination and succession as valid, the inference being drawn that the Church in general in the second and third centuries allowed succession and ordination through the second Order in the Ministry, and a further inference that the Church has always recognized the validity of such a Ministry. Now the evidence is very scanty at best. *Two writers only* mention the practice, one in the fifth, and the other in the tenth

century, and there are *no other sources of information.* The crucial point of ordination by the presbyters is not mentioned by Jerome writing in the *fifth* century, but only by the writer (Eutychius) in the *tenth* century. This point as to ordinations in the early Church, even if allowed to stand on the sole evidence of Eutychius, is of the nature of an *isolated instance or fact.* It is not paralleled in other sections of the Church in the same centuries. It came to an end (whatever the procedure was) by the authority of an Alexandrian Patriarch in A. D. 325. It did not reappear. It may have been a mistake altogether or it may be that the differentiation of functions among the three Orders had been peculiar to Egypt and that these presbyters had by transmission the power to consecrate, and that the condition of things in Alexandria was made to harmonize with the distribution of ministerial functions throughout the rest of the Church. But at any rate the case *remains isolated and anomalous and cannot be legitimately employed as a basis for a theory that Church ordinations were presbyterian.* That is very like attempting to balance a cone on its apex in stable equilibrium, or an egg upon its pointed end. Columbus solved the difficulty in the latter instance by smashing the end of the egg, and in history the trick consists in breaking the rules of logic.

Such isolated facts are *not even admissible as cumulative evidence.* They are unrelated anomalies, not several in a series correlated to one another and converging to show the existence of a general principle. I once amused a summer school of clergy on this point by assuming the proof of presbyterian ordination to the episcopate as legitimately made by combining the alleged case in Alexandria with the quasi-consecration of Coke by John Wesley, who was a Presbyter of the Church, and held the service in his bed chamber, and a third instance of Carroll consecrated to be Roman Bishop in Maryland by one Bishop and three presbyters in the private chapel of a Roman Catholic layman in England. The use, or rather abuse, of isolated facts in this way becomes a *reduction ad absurdum.*

The sole legitimate use of an isolated fact, if established, is

to preclude a universal negative. The case of Alexandrian consecrations, if admittedly presbyterian, would prevent the assertion that such a procedure as consecration by the second order never took place, and using history logically that brings the value of the instance to an end. It is exhausted.

Similar examples may be found. In the early Celtic Church the organization and distribution of territory was based upon the monastic foundations under their Abbots who had jurisdiction. Celtic Bishops had no territorial jurisdiction but exercised their functions in subordination to the Abbot of the monastery to which they were attached. This is an isolated procedure and arrangement which came to an end. It cannot rightly be brought forward as evidence that the Church recognizes and allows as a normal condition Bishops without Sees, but it does prevent us from stating that territorial jurisdiction has always without exception been attached to the episcopal office.

We have laid considerable stress upon this fallacy because it is of wide-spread use in controversy. Its employment without challenge in modern and local controversies is most insidious.

We may next notice that an absence of capacity in certain portions of an individual's historical equipment, or the neglect to develop and use certain powers that are rudimentary in all men of intelligence, will often lead into fallacious methods. Just as it is perfectly reasonable and foresighted to refuse to admit men afflicted with color-blindness to be locomotive engineers because of their incapacity to read the colored signal lights, so it is the height of unwisdom to place ourselves under the guidance and at the mercy of one whose historical sense is incapable of avoiding the misinterpretation of the signs which indicate a clear track for the following out of the course of the Church down the ages.

First of all we shall call attention to the danger that arises from an historical writer who *lacks a sense of historical perspective.*

We have smiled at what appears to us a grotesque and humorous element in Japanese art and at the absurdities of the

futurist school in modern painting. But we are told seriously that it is thus that the artist sees things. What is wrong with the scene on the Japanese fan or jar? Why, there is no perspective. All objects are represented as on the same plane actually, not as the trained eye comes to know them as at various distances from the spectator. So the dog that is close at hand will be represented of equal size with the man some distance away. A different explanation has to be given to the curious futurist representation of the "woman falling down stairs" or the "feeling of an automobile turning turtle". Here it is a case of a perspective which changes at every instant and an attempt to portray the scene thus conditioned. There are some historical writers,—it is doubtful if one can call them historians,—who follow one or the other or both of these abnormal ways of observing and trying to depict history.

By historical perspective is to be understood the method of estimating the importance of a man or an event in relation to the times in which he lived or the history of a period and the consequences of later periods so that at the distance of centuries the absolute relation is distinguishable. The fault lies in representing things and people near as gigantic, and remote individuals and happenings as of vanishing importance. Or, as the Japanese artist depicts scenes, to make everything appear as projected against a screen so that nearness and remoteness with the apparent resultant distortion will be disregarded.

To illustrate we may refer to the Paschal Controversy in the early Church. So remote is the period that we are inclined to pass by the matter as never of more than academic interest or importance. Compared with the Gorham Controversy or the Lincoln Judgment or the Kikuyu Conference (or the Panama Conference) the Paschal Question is thought of as trifling by many and it is supposed to be a waste of time to dwell much upon it. But history shows us that the controversy of the early centuries was in reality a widespread and far-reaching problem with which were bound up issues of importance to the entire Church of the period and which profoundly affected the history

of the Western Church in circles of influence down to the present day. In its relation to the question of the authority of the Roman Bishop it shows Polycarp of Smyrna and Anicetus of Rome discussing the grave question which stood in the way of uniformity and each adhering to his own custom without the anathema of Rome being hurled at the Bishop of Smyrna. It impelled Victor of Rome to arrogate authority to settle the dispute only to find himself the excommunicate Bishop while his contemporary Bishops begged him to return to the unity of love. It was closed by the authority of the Council of Nicea in a general Canon, but continued in a modified form to disturb the relations between the British and Anglo-Saxon Christians; the Synod of Whitby in 664 with an irrelevance which displays the consequences of ignorance of Church History on the part of the King and a fallacious use of authorities which is characteristic of much controversy, on the part of Wilfrid, settled the practical question and opened a fresh dogmatic question the discussion of which still goes on, viz., whether the authority of the Roman See was recognized as paramount in the early Anglo-Saxon Church.

Beside the storm and waves of this controversy Kikuyu and Panama are tempests in tea-pots, back-waters of misunderstanding where the waves of discussion, raised indeed over very grave principles, yet do not even ripple the surface of Church life in general. The true perspective of history twenty years hence may find the agitation of the present moment too microscopic to justify even casual comment.

Or let us take an illustration drawn from the position of importance assigned to individual leaders. To a multitude of people the name of John Calvin is most familiar and held to stand for something grand and weighty in the history of Western Christianity since the sixteenth century, while Athanasius of Alexandria suggests little else than the Creed which bears his name and the warnings that are disliked. Yet when the four hundredth anniversary of John Calvin was observed in 1909 the occasion almost fell flat and those who spoke or wrote did so in a largely perfunctory and apologetic style, for

Calvin's system as a system has been all but universally repudiated, with its distortion of God and its cruelty towards man; while probably for one who reads Calvin's *Institutes* ten read Athanasius's *De Incarnatione;* for one that affirms the Calvinistic doctrine of Election, a million recite the Homoousios for which Athanasius stood against the world. It is no argument, but an interesting commentary, that, in the *Century Cyclopedia of Names,* John Calvin occupies thirteen lines and Emma Calvè, the French opera singer, twelve. Athanasius has double the space allowed the Swiss Reformer.

Martin Luther is a picturesque figure with qualities that appeal in a very marked way to the popular sympathy and moreover he championed a popular cause — he was " against the government ". But few can find in Harnack's apostrophe —" He came in the fullness of time "— any real estimate of the man such as would justify the use of the same phrase which St. Paul applies to the Coming of the Son of God. Mozley's essay on Luther and other modern studies at the distance of several centuries come nearer a right perspective of the German religious revolutionary. The verdict of history passed after the necessary lapse of time does correct the faulty work of the prejudiced, partisan historian. Wiclif, often alluded to by enthusiasts as the " Morning Star of the Reformation," now appears more justly characterized as a vanishing star, or perhaps as a comet, brilliant for a brief time but rapidly disappearing, to be lost to sight forever. On the other hand Wolsey and Laud are coming at last to their own rightful places as statesmen with larger and truer conceptions than their antagonists ever conceived.

We shall find many instances of this fallacious distorting of history in the unbalanced, unfocused, ill-proportioned narratives and attempts at appreciation which too often pass unchallenged as good history.

Analogous to the fallacy of wrong historical perspective is the fallacy of *reading the past in terms of the present,* or as it may be characterized otherwise, projecting present-day conceptions upon those of earlier times until we have a kind of com-

posite photograph which is true of no one period. The fallacy is exceedingly difficult to avoid for we are not ordinarily conscious of falling into the error. The criticism of the mistake in others will most frequently put one on his guard as to his own tendencies.[3]

When the attention of students beginning their course in Church History is directed to the words of Justin Martyr on the Eucharist* contained in his Apology the question almost invariably flashes out from some member of the class — Is not this Transubstantiation? Now the explanation of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, which is known as Transubstantiation from the Latin term employed was brought forward in the twelfth century and officially adopted in the thirteenth century. It has been the subject of controversy ever since. Many impulsively assume that this controversy must be coterminous with the early Christian teaching on the Eucharistic presence and see in the words of Justin Martyr a controversial utterance. Of course a little thoughtful consideration before jumping to that conclusion would make clear that such is not the case, that Justin Martyr is giving a simple non-controversial account of elementary Christian teaching and practice to the pagan emperor and that he is not using the metaphysical language of scholastic theology. That there was little, if any, discussion of sacramental truth in the earlier centuries would appear from observant reading of the theology of the period. But once the idea has fastened upon the mind the disabusing the individual is no easy task. Every eucharistic reference will be read through the colored spectacles of prejudice for one side or the other and the real facts will be hopelessly obscured.

A most glaring exhibition of this fallacy is presented in regard to the sense of the term — Catholic — in the Creeds and in later documents, formularies and colloquial use.

---

*"For not as common bread and drink do we receive these; but like as Jesus Christ our Saviour being made flesh through the word of God took both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also were we taught that the food for which thanks are given by the word of prayer that comes from Him — food by which *flesh and blood by conversion* are nourished, is both flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."

A most fruitful historical example of the practical working of this fallacy comes to the front continually in connection with the papal claims. Three terms are continually superimposed upon one another — *primacy, supremacy* and *infallibility* — as though they were interchangeable. The resultant is the impression that either the three claims connoted by the three words arose simultaneously in the very early days of the Roman See or that they are so involved and related that supremacy grows naturally and logically out of primacy and infallibility out of supremacy. This is, of course, the contention of papal controversialists and the naive or subtly skilful employment of the terms serves tremendously to confuse issues and to help out their case.

The primacy is an historical fact, carrying with it no coercive or other essential jurisdiction. The supremacy is a claim which grew out of political and ecclesiastical circumstances by stages which can be discerned and which are not involved in the primacy. The infallibility of the Roman Bishop is a theory which has had less than fifty years for being put to the test and so far has not been worked out with conspicuous success beyond the academic state. The consequences of using these terms as though all had been employed with the modern meaning by the earliest writers are disastrous to a right setting of the Church at any period.

The fallacy is capable of being avoided by differentiating carefully expressions and terms and so that the ancient word shall not be used sometimes with its original connotation and again in its distinctly modern sense.

Neglect or incapacity in examining premises results in fallacious conclusions. As our definition from the Century dictionary indicates, this fallacy appears in two ways, drawing conclusions from unproved or unadmitted premises, or drawing wrong conclusions from correct premises.

I have before me a discussion of the Prayer Book rubric on Confirmation in relation to the status of a communicant. Certain premises are laid down as the basis for the argument and conclusion, as follows: "(1) The intention of the rubric is not

to safeguard the Holy Communion; (2) the whole intention of the rubric is to preserve the rite of Confirmation." These are very positive and unqualified assertions and demand some proof of their correctness, but none is given. I am asked to accept the theses without examination or question. If I do so it is difficult to avoid the use of them which the writer makes, and many will quite rightly assume that the writer is acting in good faith. But one who realizes the seriousness of the matter or who is cautious about taking unsupported assertions will ask for the establishing of the premises before he proceeds further with the discussion and will ask in vain for the writer passes on to use without proving his theses. Others deny their correctness historically and a categorical denial is just as valid as an affirmative in the absence of authorities.

Around the dome of S. Peter's in Rome is inscribed the sentence "*Ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*" The quotation is from a letter of S. Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage to Cornelius, Bp. of Rome. What does it mean? That the Roman Bishop is recognized by Cyprian as the centre of ecclesiastical unity, replies the upholder of the papal claims. Of course, says the trustful reader, and accepts the interpretation put upon the words without inquiring further. Wait a moment, says the critical reader. Some say that the verb should be "exoritur" instead of "exorta est". Will that make any difference? And again what does "ecclesia principalis" mean according to the sense of the words in the third century, uncolored by the claims and controversies of the twentieth. And what else has the same writer said as to the centre of ecclesiastical unity? There is a special treatise on the subject — De Unitate Ecclesiae. I must read that and other works of Cyprian and an account of his relations with the Bishop of Rome before I feel quite certain that I know what this detached phrase signifies. Accordingly the premise is allowed to stand as doubtful until a secure basis is found. Oh, we owe a great deal to the critical scholars.

This difficulty is widespread and results in the reasoning which is so illogical and so sadly popular, from the enthu-

siastic young ceremonialist who assumes that S. Paul's "cloke" which he left at Carpus was a Cope, to my little anonymous correspondent in the Albany parochial school who wrote to me "We all know that Henry VIII of England founded the Church of England; this is printed in all the English histories. Why then do you deny it? Do you think that the people are fooled? Again we know the wicked life Henry led. Why then do you follow the example of such a wicked man? Do you want to be like him?" Or to the visitor and attendant at one of our summer Churches from one of the separated bodies who said, apropos of the Cross on the Altar, that episcopal services always seemed to her to be idolatry. And on to those who ought to and I think often do know better.

If we neglect the examination of premises we shall write bad history. If we lack capacity to test the premises we should not write at all.

IV. Constructive History

In his work on *The Mystical Element in Religion* Von Huegel says, in effect, that Christianity may be summed up as consisting of three factors:—(1) the *institutional,* or Church side of things; (2) the *historical,* or intellectual sphere; (3) the *mystical* sphere, in which the souls of men have direct access to the life and love of God.

If the study of the history of the Church in its manifold bearing upon religion, personal and corporate, be omitted from the study of Christianity, the institutional and historical factors cannot be adequately grasped. If only the mystical sphere is investigated, the result is liable to be in effect a vague, subjective religion, where the individual experience alone is emphasized and the life of Jesus Christ as extended and worked out in His mystical Body, the Church, is placed in a subordinate position or ignored altogether. There is great significance in the wording of the clause about the Church in one of the early baptismal creeds—"Dost thou believe in *salvation through the Holy Catholic Church?*" And then by no means the majority of people have the mystical temper. Mystics, like poets, are born, not made. Mysticism is very much to the fore at the present time. Its three dangers have been stated as emotionalism, eclecticism and Christlessness. These can be counterbalanced and safeguarded by the study of the Church in its historical and developing life. The great mystics have been those who founded their union and life with God upon union and life within the Church, under the authority of Divine Revelation and in association with the Sacraments wherein He comes to men and abides with them.

The critical and controversial aspects of Christianity and its theology also absorb attention at the present moment, the former of scholars, the latter of the interested but unlearned. As has been emphasized in an earlier consideration of controversial history no positive good is likely to result.

The stress always needs to be laid on the constructive history and periods of the Christian Church. The edifice has been in process of erection according to a Divine plan for a good many centuries. It is easy enough to discover places where the workmanship is poor because the workmen have not followed the Architect's plan. That indicates incompetency on the part of those who have been given responsibility for performing or overseeing the work. It is not difficult to expose poor and unworthy material which tends to weaken the structure. Relative advantages in parts of the economic structure may be fair subjects for discussion possibly. But what of the building as a whole? Does it stand firmly? Has it endured the shocks and attacks of time and enemies? Is it still a shelter, a refuge, a stronghold? Has there ever been anything better? Has there ever been anything half so good?

Some interesting attempts have been made from time to time to deal with the history of the Church by beginning with the present and working back stage by stage to the Day of Pentecost. It is a fascinating experiment to make but really involves practical difficulties and a series of assumptions which are liable to obviate the very ends desired. In the first place the Church is a present fact and an institution that in essence and life is exactly the same as on the first day of its history. The analogy with a human body holds good here. The Church was complete on the Day of Pentecost, with all organs, powers, possessions and ideals that it now claims. Growth, extension, increased development of powers, fuller realization of adaptability to the needs of men are to be traced, as in the case of the human body. Certain abnormal conditions of the Christian world at the moment do not necessarily constitute valid premises for reasoning backward to the age before. In order to do that it is imperative to assume certain points which are not easy to establish without bringing in earlier history. For example, if one begins with the divided condition of Christendom at the present time, it is difficult to show that this condition must be wrong because the Church was intended to be One, without falling back upon earlier periods and the

documents of the New Testament that witness to the principle of unity and the evil of schism.

The Church, again, is a building and that building was complete eighteen centuries ago. The history of the Church is meant to show its capacity for being the Ark of salvation throughout the ages. Its history is not a narrative of continual human tinkering, of changing plans and architect and of tearing down the old from time to time in order to make way for the new. All men do not enter the building, all may not avail themselves of every privilege that the building provides, some individuals may leave the shelter of the edifice and set out to erect something better in their estimation. Some rooms in the structure may apparently be closed and disused. But the New Jerusalem came down from heaven as a bride adorned for her husband, perfect, beautiful, complete. The witness of history is the witness to that truth but it is exceedingly doubtful if the proof can be given by reading the narrative in the reverse direction, without some assumption of that which it is desired to establish.

What really can be done with considerable value by those who have traced the history of the Church in the world is to present something like a cross-section of the building where at a glance the various stages may be seen and the use or abuse of this or that portion of the structure at different periods of its existence, or to show how the building has been able to withstand attack. This is exceedingly valuable and not open to the same criticism as the proposal to write history backward.

Constructive history of the Church will begin properly with the place and time where and when "they were all with one accord in one place and suddenly there came a sound from heaven * * * and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." It might be better to say *the constructive history of the course of the Church in human history.* There are preludes to this narrative, there was a period of preparation, there was a merging of certain elements of the old dispensation in the new. These are all important, but to the same extent as all transition periods are important. We are

now, and have been since the descent of the Holy Spirit, in the last period of God's dealing with the human race for redemption. "Last of all, He sent unto them His Son, saying, They will reverence My Son." The work of the Holy Ghost in the Church is to secure for men that abiding Presence. There never can be another Incarnation nor another Pentecost.

The frank admission is now made by some apologists for one or another of the older religious bodies in separation from the historic Church, that the early history of the separation has nothing to do with the particular body at the present time. A Methodist who is confronted with John Wesley's teaching on the Sacraments is very likely to reply that Methodists have cut loose from Wesleyanism, and this is generally true. The eighteenth century leader is now a revered name but not an authority. Presbyterianism has largely disowned John Calvin so far as constructive theology is concerned and as to polity the theory of a historical succession on one ministerial order — the presbyterate — from apostolic times has been abandoned. Congregationalism has ceased to connote any one of several bodies in particular and certain Unitarian bodies call themselves officially Congregationalist. Even the papal theory gains its strength largely from its present wide practical acceptance as a successful religious organization. Backing up papal claims from history has almost invariably been carried on by a method which is equally justifiable, so far as historical method is concerned, in case of other ecclesiastical theories. The Encyclical of Leo XIII is about as transparently unhistorical a document as any in the course of eighteen centuries.[1]

The Constructive Method of dealing with the history of the Church is not popular. The "Efficiency Method" is plausible and attractive. It assumes that visible and tangible results are the true "fruits" of Christianity. The Controversial Method develops egotism and individualism on the less admirable side. These are all superficial and require little time and seldom result in "a permanent peace." The Constructive Method demands a good deal of effort and rigid restraint at many points from leaping to conclusions. Very few people will give

more than an hour to hearing about the Early Church or the Reformation period. One of my students approached me one day asking what *one book* he should read in preparation for a series of addresses on the history of the Early Church that he proposed to give to the people of the Mission where he acted as lay-reader. The advice that, for every hour of instruction he proposed to give, not less than twenty hours of reading in anticipation would be necessary (which was the lowest reasonable estimate), astonished him. I have heard of a parish priest who, wishing to give a talk on Church History to his congregation Sunday evening, sat down that afternoon with three elementary books to "get up" the material for a half hour's instruction. And on the other side the laity are equally at fault. It is next to impossible to secure the consecutive attendance of lay people at a series of even four or five instructions upon any subject or period in Church History or to read thoroughly and studiously a reliable and scholarly book on a historical subject which employs the scientific, historical method and quotes authorities and sources. It is discouraging in the extreme to find, as an experience common to all who would teach, that the more superficial acquaintance an individual has with a theological subject the more difficult it is to persuade him to acquire knowledge and to refrain from prejudiced and untenable statements. The constructive teacher is at a disadvantage in this respect. Nevertheless nothing secures the desired results except patient, thorough, thoughtful instruction.

Some suggestions will be given in this chapter to those who wish to pursue their studies in the history of the Christian Church on sound lines.

I. *Choice of Books and Historical Writers.*

No historical work should be selected to be read merely because of its conclusions. The point is to see how those conclusions have been reached and whether they are tenable on sound historical evidence. I have before me a copy of Abbot Gasquet's popular lectures delivered at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, in 1913, and published under the title — Breaking

with the Past. The writer, who can write history but was not imported for that purpose in the delivery of these lectures, has for his thesis to show that the Church in England abandoned in the sixteenth century the catholic doctrines of the Priesthood, the Sacraments and Church Authority. Having established, largely by unsupported statements, to the satisfaction of those who hold the thesis the points in question, Gasquet appends a list of "Books Suggested for Reading." The trustful reader who might reasonably expect a wide range of books of reference finds himself confronted with twenty-two titles, out of which fourteen are by Roman Catholic controversial writers, seven of them by Gasquet himself, while the few works by other writers are selected solely because they are held to contain some admissions which would be in favor of Gasquet's conclusions if entirely dissociated from other considerations. Not a hand-book of first-hand sources is mentioned and the list concludes with the pamphlet by the Bishop of Zanzibar written at the time of the Kikuyu Controversy, which must have come into the hands of Gasquet with the ink hardly dry, to be included in the list. Very likely this amazingly naive and transparently unhistorical set of lectures is circulated and recommended because the conclusions reached are the sole object. This is not constructive history. It is historical juggling. Yet how many readers, in selecting books on Church History, follow the habit so frequently ascribed to the feminine novel reader, of looking to see how the book ends up! A reasonable comment upon Gasquet's lectures and many another series from quite different sources would be: What a poor and slender case it must be which has to adopt such a childish method!

If the following suggestion comes under the eye of men thorough and eminent in their profession or branch of learning, it should appeal strongly to them. Give preference always to really *great* books of history. Condensations, primers, first-books and other elementary designations, may be useful for outlines if based upon true history and reliable authorities, but they can never make history live. *Great* books are not

necessarily *large* books nor many-volumed but works that have endured the tests and criticisms of readers and experts and are proved to have been weighty and permanent contributions to the literature of the subject. They cannot be ignored by the historical student, whether he accepts the conclusions reached or not. As a notable instance we may refer to Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." The writer was avowedly an antagonist of the claims of Christianity, but he is an historian of the highest rank and his admissions as to the widespread influence and wonderful growth of the Christian Church together with the straits to which he is put to explain the phenomena without conceding the divine origin of Christianity stand unparalleled in significance as an apologetic for the Church.

In the class of historical writings entitled to be called great will be included among modern historians the works of William Bright, Bishop Creighton, Bishop Stubbs, Mr. Freeman, R. W. Dixon, James Gairdner, S. R. Gardiner, Hefelé, Doellinger, Duchesne, the Cambridge Histories and the *Histoire Generale* edited by Lavisse and Rambaud, all these being named as ordinarily accessible in first-class public and theological libraries. The constructive study of Church History cannot neglect them.

In the very brief space we may give to these suggestions we can do no more than emphasize a few points. First-class historical works should be read again and again, if not as a whole at least in certain sections. And while the temptation is continually to keep to the history proper, the value of reading with care all appendices and foot-notes is inestimably great. In certain cases the historical text is in the main a nucleus around which is gathered an immense amount of historical and illustrative material which is quite missed by the reader who ignores such running commentary.

Special subjects should be studied in the writings of specialists. That seems and is a truism, but one often ignored. Specialists have generally become such because of particular gifts and aptitudes in a certain subject. Lightfoot had peculiar

powers for historical criticism of documents. Not half a dozen scholars in several centuries have had anything like his ability as exhibited in the problem of the Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. The late Mr. Denny specialized in certain aspects of the claims of the papacy, Bishop Creighton and Dr. Bright and Father Puller in other aspects. Dixon and Gairdner worked only on the Tudor period in English Church History. Their writings are not likely to be superseded. Of course the treatises of great historians and historical specialists are hard reading. All getting beneath the surface of subjects entails strenuous study, but there is no easy path to the solution of the problems of history.

Two methods of presenting history, from other than the method of scientifically constructed narrative, which throw strong sidelights on events and men, are biography and the philosophy of history. The former makes the life of the Church unfold itself like a vivid drama with all the vigorous vitality and freshness that we associate with the dramatic art where personality counts for so much. The latter shows how the underlying principles of the kingdom of Christ on earth have been worked out and illustrated and combined with other factors so as to produce certain results. Here we discover the truth of Tennyson's observation, that

"Through the ages one eternal purpose runs
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

If you want to get a very full insight into the Oxford Movement hardly anything will be better than Liddon's four-volume Life of Dr. Pusey. There are many such biographical works which are indispensable in the constructive study of the history of the Church. For the philosophy of Church History, Creighton's Historical Essays and other occasional writings, Mozley's Essays Historical and Theological, Waterman's "God's Balance of Faith and Freedom," Hobhouse's Bampton Lectures, "The Church and the World," are examples.

There must be many who from time to time formulate aloud or in their own thoughts the question, Are there any principles

or historical conclusions which may be treated as established? The immense mass of controversial theology, ancient and modern, would seem to give some color to the cavil that nothing is positively settled. The constructive study of ecclesiastical history is mainly concerned with the effort to secure the recognition of some historical truths as practically closed questions. The evidence may be repeatedly examined and freshly stated, but without any alteration of the result. People are sometimes frankly puzzled by the refusal of the Church to decry such fresh arrangement and statement of the grounds on which truths rest. A knowledge of the various phases of such re-examinations would show them that the case in each instance almost invariably gains in solidity and strength by the process rather than the contrary.

We shall conclude this phase of our subject by noting:

II. *Some Historical Points which may be considered permanently established.*

We shall state the several points with conservatism, in such wise that few if any will be bold enough to challenge them in the light of the evidence.

(1) The Continuity of the Christian Church of the present day unbroken from the Day of Pentecost.

There has been no break. Even with a considerable latitude of definition as to what is meant by the Christian Church continuity is exhibited. Whether we take the statement of the Thirty-Nine Articles,—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance," or the extreme in another direction, that "The Christian Church is an association of people for the maintenance of public worship for those who care for it," history shows continuity. There is no sufficient evidence to indicate that the original group ever died out, and another sprang up which revived certain opinions of its predecessor but differed radically, and that this process has been going on recurrently. This fact of continuity is an all-important

premise in a number of related syllogisms having to do with the Church today.[2]

(2) From whatever point we approach the history of this continuous Christian body it cannot be denied that the religious world at the present period presents three subdivisions and no more.[3] We find Christian bodies which officially denominate themselves as *catholic,* three especially — Eastern, Latin and Anglican; and another series consists of bodies calling themselves Christian, but repudiating the term — catholic. They are officially on their own representation *non-catholic.* If we compare the first group with the second, history will afford strong evidence for the contention that the members of the first group have underlying characteristics which all three consider essential and a few which all three do not consider essential. On the other hand the members of the second or non-catholic group hold, each of them, something to be essential which the others and the catholic group do not estimate in this way; deny each something which one or more consider vital; and all differ from the members of the catholic group on one or several points which the latter hold to be of the essential constitution of the Christian Church.

A third group constitutes a *non-Christian* series. The members of the group may be unitarian, theistic, or otherwise, but their negative and common characteristic, the denial that Jesus is God, even though they in some sense and in some degree find a place for Christ in their system, separates them effectively from both the other groups officially.

The full study of the three groups, the first critically, the second sympathetically, the third honestly, will emphasize the radical divergences between the groups, and the history of them all will witness to the fact that the groups do not really shade off insensibly into one another but have between them gulfs that cannot be bridged over. To give an illustration which cannot be expanded here, the highest Unitarian is nowhere near the same as the lowest Trinitarian, and the Irvingite body which calls itself catholic is unable by any terms or language to secure what the most evangelical of Catholics has, whether

he appreciates it or not, the episcopate of historic and apostolic succession.

(3) However the historians of the three Catholic Communions may disagree on certain subjects in their mutual history all alike can show with little difficulty that they trace back to a time when intercommunion had not been interrupted and so back to the Apostolic Age and the Day of Pentecost, while certain positive features and fruits to be observed in their later history afford a presumption that the present suspension of official intercommunion is due not to loss of primitive and essential characteristics but to causes, not trivial nor unimportant, but yet not of such a nature as to destroy the identity of each member of the group with the Church which is neither Eastern nor Western, Latin or Anglican, but Catholic, One, Apostolic and Holy.

(4) In *some sense* the possession of the episcopate of apostolic succession is witnessed to as the safeguard of orthodoxy and vitality.[4] This is a most fascinating subject for research and evidence. A part of the evidence lies where it is voluntary blindness not to see it. The Apostles' Creed, for instance, is officially set forth and required, unmutilated, undenied in every article, positively taught in formularies by the Christian bodies that have kept and claim to have kept the episcopate, *and nowhere else.* Some apparent exceptions to this sweeping statement disappear on careful examination, we add for the sake of noting that the challenge of the assertion is not unanticipated. The same is true in regard to vitality, little as the different members of the catholic group have on which to congratulate themselves for their correspondence to all their opportunities. Phariseeism is an ugly thing and we could not defend such an assertion did not that very assertion stand as the direct outcome of the catholic doctrine that the Church is a divine organism and all that is vital and energizing comes directly from its Divine Founder and the Divine Spirit in-dwelling. Change, breaches with their own history, reorganization, denials are obvious in the history of non-episcopal bodies. Witness the lapse of Trinitarian Congregationalism into bald Sabellian Unitarianism.

(5) In *some sense* the Sacramental system produces results unobtainable otherwise. This is a delicate and holy subject. The witness of the past is overwhelming, but the appreciation of the issue is bound up with a score of related matters. What is Christian Character? A high achievement in the natural virtues, kindness, self-restraint, generosity, courage, prudence; or a development of the distinctively Christian virtues, Faith, Hope and Love, along with the interior virtues, humility, meekness, purity, self-sacrifice? Have these latter developed outside the Sacramental Grace which the Church dispenses? We must remember that the initial sacrament, Holy Baptism, may be administered validly although no further sacraments follow, and that the baptized receive real grace. Probably no one contention is likely to call forth such an outburst of indignant challenge as this, that the monopoly of the highest type of Christian sanctity belongs to the Christian body which posesses and dispenses *all* the treasures of sacramental grace which is the Divine Life. Yet the witness is written very clearly on the pages of eighteen centuries of the history of the sacramental Church.[5]

(6) The phenomena of unrest and revolutionary movements when examined over a wide extent of time in the Church's life have an interpretation which does not lie on the surface. They indicate not that the Church is in the wrong or that she is lacking in the ability to supply what men need, but that the human element is at fault and paying the penalty of unadmitted and unrecognized limitations. Distortion of revealed truth, the loss of balance between related truths, the neglect of essentials are set side by side with efforts to restore, recover and readjust. There is a close analogy between the health of the spiritual body and of the physical body. Illness is not necessarily a sign that the body is diseased. It may be the beneficent sign that the limitations of the body have been ignored or the laws of health broken. The body that is vigorous and perfect throws off illness or even disease, and recovers. The Body of Christ, the Church, has been continually experiencing the consequences of the neglect in some quarter or another of the laws of spirit-

ual, corporate health. The testimony to the need and value of the repair of the Christian Body by the divine life within is the continual answer to the cavils of those who would discredit it and innovate or begin afresh. Very salutary is the study of heresy and schism.

There are other principles which are capable of being set forth as established and which are also to be included in the fundamental premises of constructive history. Each of those named and briefly commented upon here, along with others, will be found to afford the groundwork upon which the Church builds up spiritual lives. How different the study of the divine organism becomes when approached thus, as an edifice, a structure which does not collapse periodically like a house of cards! How different, on the other hand, from a series of houses built on quite different plans and models,— the ideal of the aristocratic building like the millionaire's palace meant for the rich only, or the colonial type which is satisfactory only in certain surroundings, or the bungalow type, suitable for times of emptiness and vacation, or the portable house type which can be easily taken down and re-erected in another place, or a row of cells where each individual dwells by himself to be protected and housed, regardless of other individuals? The mighty cathedral seems to approach most nearly to a type of the Church as constructive history shows its rearing. But alas! even the cathedral is the work of man and man may lay it in ruins. The true figure of the Catholic Church is the "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This is what the true use of Church History patiently worked out shows the Catholic Church to be.

V. Foundation Facts versus Favorite Fallacies

The Early Church

IN a characteristically keen and concise analysis of the present-day attitude of the different sections of western Christendom towards religious truth Bishop Mandell Creighton writes thus: "The work of the Church of England is to maintain truth held according to liberty, yet with order. The Church of Rome cares for truth and order, but subordinates truth. The nonconformists care for truth and liberty, but truth is dissolved into opinion. It is hard to maintain the three together, but this constitutes England's work." The historical school to which Creighton belonged has gained the respect of the modern world of historical students because of its patient and thorough scholarship, scientific method, love of fair play, judicial wisdom in summing up the evidence, and wholesome conservatism in estimating results. Impatient and superficial minds are not unlikely to find such accuracy, balance and deliberateness disappointing. Brilliant writers who rush rapidly along without stopping to quote authorities are more popular. Nevertheless, difficult as is the task of maintaining historical truth with due regard for Church order and without violation of the liberty of the individual to judge for himself, the English historians of this type are a bulwark in defense of truth, order and liberty in the Church. It is due to their solid work that the case for catholicity as opposed to protestantism, of catholicity as contrasted with papalism, and of the witness of history to the Divine origin and continual vitality of the Christian religion as distinguished from all other religions, is being stated with increasingly convincing force.

In the preceding chapter certain historical points were stated which are widely conceded to be established by the application of the scientific method of weighing the witnesses and evidence.

These points were carefully and conservatively formulated with the distinct purpose of avoiding some of the pitfalls against which warning has already been sounded. These matters are really fundamental and the basis on which constructive Church History rests. Many other considerations logically result and develop from them. Hence these foundation facts are the continual object of attack. It is quite the wrong conclusion to draw from the repeated attacks that the positions are weak and the value slight. Just the opposite is true. The adversaries fear that the position of the Church is impregnable. They hope to find a weak place. Consequently there is a continual repetition of assaults. "The rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock."

For example, no one expends much time in attacking and disproving the polity of the Irvingites, a ministry of apostles, angels, prophets, evangelists, elders, deacons, and so on. The sole evidence is the series of revelations which Edward Irving claimed to have received. On the other hand, the three-fold Ministry of Apostolic Succession is fiercely impugned again and again. The evidence is strong, but more than that, questions of Church authority, valid rites, continuity of faith and order and transmission of doctrine and of ministerial powers are inseparably bound up with this polity claiming Divine institution. Hence the persistent harking back to the denials and objections which are so sadly familiar. Yet with all these determined efforts to undermine a historical fact and so to get rid of related matters the calm and unqualified positiveness of the Preface to the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer holds good, "It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church — Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

But as certain supposedly damaging objections are recurrently raised and given to the uncritical with a plausible force which easily deceives, it will be useful to examine some of these foundation facts and the common objections often put forward.

Sometimes such objections are valid as objections, but have only the value of difficulties. They do not necessarily cast doubt upon the position as one that can only be maintained by an unsupported denial of the objection. "Ten thousand difficulties do not constitute one doubt," says an apologist of the Faith. Our great thinker, Bishop Butler, has emphasized the attitude that we ought to expect difficulties in understanding revealed truth. The course of the Church through the history of the world is beset with innumerable difficulties which do not halt but only impede it. Similar difficulties in non-Christian religions or in partial presentations of Christianity, *e. g.*, the separated bodies that have arisen in the West since the sixteenth centuary, have quite different results. There is a marked liability in their cases to change the course entirely or to introduce the beginnings of break-up and disintegration.

On the other hand, many supposed objections turn out to be fallacies, due to misunderstanding or to the misstatement of facts. These fallacies are exposed on thoughtful consideration, or by rigidly applying their contention to other than the particular points at issue. The only serious difficulty is the refusal of so many to give a patient hearing and a fair judgment to the careful statement of the whole case.

It will be useful to examine, not exhaustively but (it is hoped) suggestively, a few of the more frequently encountered objections and fallacies which are set in opposition to the fundamental facts in the constitution and claims of the Church. The selection is based upon a considerable experience in setting forth Church History constructively for groups of people of many types.

I. *The Historicity of the Church.*

The term, historicity, is a clumsy word. It has, however, become current in recent theological literature. It is employed to indicate the objective existence of a person or the occurrence of an event in bald reality, unmixed with legend, as distinct from a creation, in whole or in part, of the imagination, incapable of being dealt with under the laws of historical evidence. The

term and the controversial examination of its applicability are found in connection with the Founder of Christianity. Was Jesus Christ, quite apart from what He said and what His followers thought of Him, in the naked meaning of the phrase, an historical personage? Was the Resurrection an actual historical fact? Is He in objective existence to-day? Is He objectively and historically working now? Questions like these may be and have been asked with regard to Homer and Homeric heroes and events described in the poems attributed to the great epic poet. They are inquiries legitimate enough in themselves. Hundreds of thousands of years hence very likely such questions will be propounded about Napoleon Bonaparte and the Duke of Wellington; about Lord Kitchener and his mysterious disappearance from the world of throbbing activities.

The only restriction upon such investigation to be insisted upon is that the supreme significance of the issue shall not be used as a prejudgment for or against the fact as historical or the opposite, when once the evidence has been produced, interpreted and weighed. The importance to human life whether the Homeric heroes actually lived is negligible in comparison with the importance of the truth or falsity of the Life, Death and Resurrection of the Jesus of the Creeds. But no criteria are admissible in regard to the latter which would not be rigidly applied in other similar investigations. Because Jesus Christ is a unique figure in history and Achilles and Ulysses are not, we are not at liberty to reject the former as beyond human experience and therefore incredible. Akin to this method is the assumption that miracles did not happen, could not happen, do not happen. One has only to apply the method rigidly to see how disastrously it works in a score of other concerns of life.

Now the objection to the historicity of the Church from a certain day and date in history, viz., the Day of Pentecost, is sometimes set forth in such a way as to puzzle and distress very sincere people who have never had any doubt at all on the subject. It is said (1) that the only evidence we have comes from documents and assertions of interested parties, the Apostles and other adherents to these men; (2) that the organization of the

Christian Church took place somewhat late in the first century of the so-called Christian era, and that the quasi-historical background was concocted to connect the organization with some one who might be elevated into the position of founder and leader; (3) that our literature and information as to the early days and years of the Church are so meagre at best as to compare disastrously with the historical attestation which is extant concerning other religions and religious organizations that put forward much less ambitious claims.

Now these objections imply that, if they can be sustained, the Church is peculiar and exceptional in these respects. That is the inference obviously intended to be drawn, and incautious inquirers are liable to be entrapped. As a matter of fact, so far from such a condition being uncommon and exceptional the opposite is true. Every one of the points stated above against the claim of the Christian Church to be historical in its origin and early years can be made to the rise of the majority of religious bodies or other organizations of a similar nature. For instance, exactly the same difficulties occur concerning the rise of the nineteenth century cult denominated Christian Science, its founder, the meagreness of documentary evidence relating to its origin and passage into an organized society, and the dependence upon devotees of the cult mainly for information. Yet, while one may find oneself unable to accept anything else about Christian Science, its "historicity" is not questioned. Go back to Mahomet and the rise of Islam and the same objections might be made with much greater force than against the beginnings of the Church. Yet no one claims that Mahometanism is not historical. Here is one of the arguments that proves too much which under one guise or another is sadly popular and frequently advanced.

In detail, as the first objection is often stated, it is inaccurate. The only historical testimony is not confined to Christian writings. Evidence of the *corroborative* species is to be gathered from the mention of Christians and their history by Tacitus, a historian of the very first rank, who had not the slightest sympathy with either Christianity or Judaism, but

whose life spanned the period between A. D. 54 and 119; by Suetonius, contemporary and friend of Tacitus, who mentions the Christians in his references to the persecutions under Claudius and Nero; by Josephus, the "Hebrew Livy," whose reference to Jesus as the Messiah, the circumstances and date of His death as under Pilate, His Resurrection, and the large number of followers named Christians from Him, has recently received some substantiation from fresh evidence to offset the critical objections to authenticity. To these names may be added those of Pliny the Younger who in the first decade of the second century made an unprejudiced investigation of the history of Christianity in the province of Asia Minor and the Emperor Hadrian, whose letter to the Consul Servianus gives undesigned, if very slight corroboration, to the historical fact of the Christian body as distinct from the Jews.[1]

It is certainly true that the chief knowledge and witness concerning the early Church comes from its own adherents and writers. From what source does the historian usually expect to gather the fullest information, if not from those most intimately acquainted with the subject under investigation? Would one expect to find the Roman Bishop giving us to-day our fullest account of the rise and progress of Christian Science, or the Cardinal Archbishop of New York to be accounted the only reliable source of information as to the origin of Mormonism? We may find in any adverse pronouncement on the subject of either of these nineteenth century religions testimony to their historicity. We look to their own writers for the facts claimed as true and test in the ordinary way the salient features of the religions and their special writings, "Science and Health," and "The Book of Mormon." No, the Christian Church, so far as historicity is concerned, is not in a unique position simply because the fullest positive information comes from friends.

The second objection, that the connecting of the religious organizations of the second century with the great Jewish Leader of the early first century is an afterthought, demands very full and positive evidence to sustain it. Here is the happy hunting-ground of the critic armed with a theory. The number of

theories is almost exactly equal to the number of critics. There is something to be said for each of them, a good deal, perhaps, for a very few, but, for the most part, they mutually destroy one another when placed in parallel columns. And now as the very latest we have the Book of the Acts of the Apostles disintegrated into Luke I and Luke II. The comment of dear old Father Benson is humorously applicable, as he refers to the Moslem attempt to identify the forecast of the Old Testament writer with the founder of Islam. "The great desire of some Moslems who came to controvert with . . . was to show that Isaiah LX referred to Mohammed! And that the Arabians under Omar who built the Mosque were "the righteous nation loving the truth" who were prophesied as entering in! Poor II Isaiah! What with Germany and Arabia his fate is as sad as St. Paul's beneath his commentators."

Over against these ingenious but unconvincing theories stands the concurrent witness, not only of the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, who has been strongly vindicated as a trustworthy historian, and the writings of St. Paul and St. John, but a set of documents outside the New Testament, consisting of letters, instructions, memoirs, expositions and visions, which overlap the New Testament times and documents. Just as some clever scholar seems to have made a point in favor of his theory with the biblical material, he is confronted with some of these first and second century documents outside the Canon of the New Testament and told by his critic friends that his theory cannot be squared with the inspired and uninspired writings at the same time. Well, let them work away. St. Luke can still hold the field as an authority better than any other now at hand, and when backed up by the investigations of Eusebius, the "Father of Ecclesiastical History," and others, presents a case too strong to be set aside excepting on very solid grounds.

But, says the third objection, your material is so very meagre for so important a matter, of infinite consequences. Alas! that is true! Would that we possessed all of St. Paul's letters and the material that St. Luke had gathered which might have been used for a third volume to supplement the Third Gospel and the

Book of the Acts, and to fill in the period between St. Paul's first imprisonment and his final trial and his death. Would that we possessed the narratives to which St. Luke alludes when he begins his account of our Lord's life for Theophilus. If only St. John or St. Timothy had left us an account of the development of the Christian Ministry in Ephesus! But is not such survival of documentary literature too much to be expected under the circumstances, and is it not remarkable and a matter for profound reflection that so much has survived under difficulties almost inconceivable and bearing with such directness and force upon the essential things? No stenographers, no printing presses, no fire-proof libraries, no archives until the monasteries began not only to multiply but to preserve manuscripts. Remember the romance of the Ignatian Epistles, whose recovery dates from A. D. 1497, the long lost Teaching of the Twelve Apostles not available in modern times until 1883, the Epistle of Clement of Rome surviving until 1875 in one manuscript only.

And as to scantiness of material, Mr. Headlam remarks: "While the poverty of material means that often the evidence on a particular point is slight and the arguments inconclusive, and while personal bias and convictions will always be factors of interpretation, yet the history of the origin of Christianity and its historical setting in Judaism and the Roman Empire are better known than is the case with the majority of religions."

No, the attempts to break down the historicity of the Church and its development from the Risen and Ascended Christ as His Body indwelt by the Holy Ghost cannot succeed so long as the scientific method of studying history is employed. The evidence is of increasing rather than diminishing force.

II. *The Christian Ministry and Apostolic Succession.*

With the mere statement of this point there appears to be an immediate leap into the midst of bitter controversy. Yet there is not the slightest intention now to be controversial, but to point out some of the misunderstandings which underlie the recurring discussions on the subjects of the transmission of the powers of the Christian Ministry and the historical process

of differentiating the Orders of Ministers. "Controversy," says some one very pithily, "is very apt to have the effect of boiling water upon tea-leaves, in bringing out what is poisonous after it has brought out what is refreshing." No further inquiry is proposed than will tend to relieve rather than complicate the situation.

Dean Stanley is quoted as remarking that whatever one may think about Apostolic Succession as a doctrine, there is no doubt of it as an historic fact. The historically attested fact should come first in order of consideration, though the associated doctrine is itself the matter of primary importance. The doctrine asserts that there is one method employed exclusively by the Church from the beginning to certify that the full powers of the Christian ministry have been duly transmitted and truly received. There is a distinction clearly made by St. Paul in the first verse of his epistle to the Galatian Church (one of the undisputed epistles). He claims not to have received his commission as Apostle from any human source nor even through human agency, but directly and without any human medium from Jesus Christ and God the Father. (Gal. I, 1.) This statement, in a document which is dated A. D. 58, in answer to a challenge apparently made again and again by his judaizing opponents, implies that two methods of transmission of the authority and powers of the Christian Ministry were perfectly well known. The method which he disclaims as applying to himself is the practice of laying-on-of-hands by officers whose function was to perform this act of ordination. This is the only method witnessed to in the New Testament writings which bear upon the subject, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and a few other references in St. Paul's letters. The direct ordination, viz., from Christ Himself without any human agent is extraordinary and there must be some strong attestation for it, as for example when St. Paul claims that "the signs of an Apostle were wrought among" Corinthian Christians. The ordinary method is by the act of officers who can present their credentials showing them to have power and authority to ordain.

This ordinary method of transmission of ministerial powers is unchallenged by any weighty authority until the sixteenth century in the West.[2] Even those who have in one way or another come to be separated from the historic Church still keep the method and practice of the Church. The claim to the possession of full ministerial power and authority immediately from Christ is very rare throughout all the Christian centuries and is principally confined to founders of new religions who are unable to secure official links with the past, or sporadic cases, like that of Pastor Russell who to the end of his life remained unrecognized by even such Christian organizations as cast scorn upon the Church's claim and method. Even Congregationalist deacons, who are in no sense thought of as clergy, are, if we remember aright set apart to their positions by a laying-on-of-hands, by their own pastor and other deacons.

One Order in the Church has for a distinctive function the power to take the initiative in the transmission of full ministerial power and authority, the highest Order which exercises all functions, and after the days of the Apostles, when titles became differentiated and attached to offices, its members came to be known as Bishops. The title is not the main issue, but the office. While, for instance, the titles are used to some extent interchangeably in the New Testament and other early writings, the office and its functions stand out with distinctness. Timothy could do what the presbyter-bishops and the deacons could not do. He could ordain. He was the ultimate guardian of the treasure of the Faith. By what title he was called we do not know. Later on, other officers of similar functions received a technical name which they have borne since with distinct significance — the title, Bishop. Officers and characteristic functions come first, then the terms assigned to such officers. The main question is as to the office and its prerogatives. The title is secondary. A popular fallacy, which is used continually to draw attention from the main issues, is to dwell upon the title and argue from various titles to a confusion of functions or a denial of several orders of officers.

An illustration of this misleading reversal of historical

growth is at hand in a consideration of the different titles borne by the chief administrative officer in the colleges of an English University. In Oxford we find the Provost of Oriel, the Warden of Keble, the Master of Baliol, the President of Magdalen, the Dean of Christ Church, the Rector of Exeter and the Principal of Brasenose. Each one of the officers bearing a different title is the "Head" and perhaps some day a great controversy will arise over these terms while the existence of two other University officers, the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, will be forgotten. Or we might illustrate from the various uses of the term Dean. It is borne by the head of a cathedral chapter, by the head of a college or seminary, by the disciplinary officer who is Dean of residence, by the presiding officer in an ecclesiastical court, e. g. the Dean of Arches, and by the appointed head of a rural deanery. Illustrations might be multiplied. In the literature of the early Church episcopos, presbuteros, and even diakonos may be found applied to the same office, as the Twelve also are entitled by St. John both apostles and disciples, yet the functions exercised in each case, not the title, decide the status. Again, the lists given by St. Paul in I Corinthians XII and Ephesians IV show the indeterminate nature of titles in his day, while there is not any serious difficulty in discovering how gradually the ordinary and extraordinary offices became distinct and the functions peculiar for a time to the latter are found exercised permanently by the former. No, we must avoid the fallacy of arguing from titles in a formative period, and must look closely for officers with characteristic powers and functions. Both the Presbyterian and Congregational theories break down under this test.

Again it is important to beware of the fallacy which is implied frequently rather than formulated, that the Apostolate came to an end and the threefold Ministry succeeded it by a new arrangement. Historically it is plain that such was not the case. The lives of St. John, St. Andrew and St. Philip overlapped by a considerable number of years the rise and crystallization of the episcopate in Asia Minor. The testi-

mony of early writers like Irenaeus and Tertullian, side by side with early and trustworthy tradition, assert that St. Paul and St. Peter lived on while one set apart by them to the office of chief pastor in the local Roman Church was living. There was no break. The witness and the historical interpretation of the earliest writers on this point are uncompromisingly stated in Lightfoot's much misunderstood and misinterpreted essay on The Christian Ministry which seems now-a-days to be read by few except through glasses colored with their own prejudices and assumptions. "The evidence for the early and wide extension of episcopacy throughout proconsular Asia," remarks Lightfoot in one passage, "the scene of St. John's latest labors, may be considered irrefragable."[3]

Many find a mechanical difficulty in the method supposed to be employed in the transmission of full ministerial powers by the agency of certain officers, the Bishops. A common assumption that the succession is a chain of separate links, so that if one link is broken off the succession falls apart and ceases, is often fostered or allowed to pass uncorrected. The succession from the Apostles' days is a most intricate and ever more complex *network*. Any line of transmission is sufficient through any set of ordaining Bishops. The Church at first employed several members of the highest order, the episcopate, in the transmission of the powers of that order. Then as soon as a tendency to carelessness was discerned rules of procedure were laid down for a minimum of three or sometimes seven to consecrate to the episcopal office. In practice many more usually have officiated at the laying-on-of-hands. Thus security has been provided against a break in transmission through defects of one kind or another which may conceivably occur from time to time. Nothing therefore depends upon a single link in a chain. There are no single links. Mr. Gladstone has calculated that with the canonical and other safeguards which the Church has established for preserving an unbroken succession the chances that any Bishop at any particular consecration has been invalidly empowered is "as 512,000,000,000 to unity." If any one will

take the pains to make for himself a chart of the succession of Bishops in his own diocese back through several episcopates and the officiating consecrators he will be impressed with the ease with which the mechanical objection breaks down.

The lists of Bishops in the great city sees of the early Church are extant and of trustworthiness to such an extent as to bridge over the critical period from the apostolic age to the third century. When that point has been reached no further necessity remains for meeting objections to the fact of historical succession in the episcopate.

Other important points on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession belong to the sphere of dogmatic theology and liturgics. It is to be borne in mind that different departments of theology do supplement one another with strong confirmatory effect.

III. *The Roman Church in the First Six Centuries.*

Great care and watchfulness need to be exercised by the reader of controversial and partisan works which have to do with the history of the Church in the West, because of the recurrence of the logical error or trick of the "distributed middle," i. e. the failure to use the same term with identical meaning in the premises and conclusion. It is well not only to examine premises with the utmost care in historical work but to scan the terms used in order to discover the fallacious employment of words.

Probably no instance of this is more frequently encountered than in the phrase — the Roman Church. Identically the same words are used to denote such extremes of extension as, on the one hand, the little group of Christians in the city of Rome to whom St. Paul wrote his letter, and, on the other hand, the great modern Communion which arrogates to itself world-wide or even universal jurisdiction. You may find half a dozen senses in which the term is used between these extremes — the Church in the city of Rome, in the diocese of Rome, in the Western Patriarchate, as synonymous with orthodoxy, as Petrine, as supreme, as infallible. Some of these are legitimately connoted by the phrase — the Roman Church; others

introduce assumptions and implications, which must face strong challenge as historically untenable before any decisions may be based upon the assumptions.

Some of the historical illustrations of these varying phases during the first six centuries of the Christian era are suggestive in view of modern papal and controversial claims. No more can be done within the limits of this lecture than to state them. They will bear fuller examination in the works of careful historians and in the extant documents which are our sources.

That the local Roman Church had an apostolic founder cannot be established by evidence at hand. The tradition that St. Peter was the "founder" lacks confirmatory support, and depends too much upon the argument from silence. So candid and thorough a historian as the Abbè Duchesne writes: "Whose hands had sown the Divine seed in this ground, where it was to bring forth such a prodigious harvest? We shall never know. Conjectures, built upon foundations too insecure to be sanctioned by history, take the Apostle Peter to Rome during the first year of Claudius (42 A. D.), or even under Caligula (39 A. D.)." And again, "About this time when St. Paul regained his liberty, St. Peter came to Rome. He had, perhaps, been there before; this is possible, but it cannot be proved. And we have no information whatever as to his apostolic work in Rome. The writings which have come down to us, whether canonical or not, contain no information on this point." *

On the other hand the residence of both St. Paul and St. Peter in the city of Rome and their martyrdom there are admitted as historical facts by historians generally. "The main pieces of evidence are independent and consistent. When combined they form a body of proof which is practically irresistible." The two Apostles stand before us in historical and archaeological research as joint patrons, rather than "founders," of the local Church. Under their patronage we have the handing on of the full powers of the Christian Ministry to another, probably Linus, and the strong witness

* Duchesne, The Early History of the Church, I, pp. 41, 45 (English trans.).

to the point of succession through Apostles, contained in the Epistle to the Corinthian Church by Clement, without much doubt the third Bishop of the city. The local Roman Church, then, developed in practically the same way as other great contemporaneous local churches, as for example, the Church in Antioch and in Ephesus. Anything like the strictly Petrine foundation and "episcopate," as asserted by Leo XIII, in his Encyclical, have to be *read into* documents and accompanied by assumptions that any historian will immediately challenge. An "infallible" writer may make historical assertions but is unable to manufacture historical evidence.

As to any inherent and unique orthodoxy of the Roman See, the evidence is not confirmatory without manipulation. A mere negative theology which does not speak out clearly and decisively is not quite the same as the orthodoxy claimed, while certain individual cases of notable lapse into error, as in the history of Liberius and Honorius, have always been rather difficult for the controversialist to get over, and for the historian they must stand as cases of distinct error.

The first sign of the assumption of supremacy is found in the utterances of Leo I., in the fifth century and at that time the Roman See was only the city and contiguous territory, by no means the whole of Italy. The relations between that See in the imperial city and other great western sees, such as Milan, Arles and Cordova, are very illuminating on the subject of any *acknowledged* supremacy of the Roman Bishop or admitted inclusion in his jurisdiction. All these and other historical points show with what caution the expression — the Roman Church — must be used by historical writers in order to avoid a confusion of evidence and issues.

Only one further subject in this connection may be mentioned. The magnificent boast, that "Rome does not change, has not changed, cannot change," in the light of history becomes not only arrogant but absurd and ridiculous. The city itself archaeologically at the present day is, in parable, the history of the city ecclesiastically. One finds on the surface modern Rome; in a stratum beneath, mediaeval Rome; still further down early

Christian Rome, and underneath all pagan Rome. So from the early Christian times from pagan Rome emerged the Roman church as the christianized Greek-speaking fusion of the Jewish and Gentile Christian bodies under the patronage of St. Paul and St. Peter, an organized diocese with the monarchical episcopate. That underlies still the true ecclesiastical history of the Christian city. A new phase appears with the claim to supremacy in the early Middle Ages and the Petrine theory based upon early forgeries and unfounded assumptions, while last is found the modern ultramontane theory of universal jurisdiction and specious but undefinable and impracticable infallibility.

Other subjects of importance need to be examined in such a manner as is suggested in outline here. The material for doing so is easily accessible. Patience, careful thinking, deliberate judgment are the qualities especially needed to carry on constructively such investigations.

VI. Foundation Facts versus Favorite Fallacies

The Church in England

MORE than twenty years ago, when the writer had been out of the Seminary but three years, on his first visit to England, he got into conversation with an English working-man on a June evening, near Winchester. The Englishman inquired with interest about the Church in the United States and how its situation differed from that of the Church of England. "Of course," he said, "I know that the President is not the head of your Church." "No," the writer replied fervently and thankfully, "he is not." "Well," continued the other, "in England the Queen (Her Majesty Victoria was then on the throne) is the head of the English Church." The occasion was not propitious nor the speaker probably prepared for a lecture on the subject of the relations between the Church and the Sovereign in England, and the matter could not be carried further. A vivid impression has, however, lingered in the writer's mind of the persistency of this erroneous idea in the minds of many to the present day, many documents and much historical writing to the contrary notwithstanding.

A series of assumptions has become interwoven in the consciousness of people of the present day regarding the Church to such an extent that only patience and perseverance in accurate and fair teaching can disentangle the facts from the fiction. The fostering of the misrepresentations is traceable in part to protestant rejection, without unprejudiced examination, of anything in history that "unchurches" the separated bodies; in part to dislike of any strong presentment of the Church's position which interferes with individualism and goes down very

deep into the issues involved in the Christian profession; and, sadly enough, in some measure, to the antagonism and presumption on the part of the Latin Church when any portion of Christendom challenges with strong evidence the claim of the Roman Communion to the monopoly of the possession and name of Catholicity.

Nevertheless, the understanding of the truth of the matter for our communion is becoming clearer, as a result primarily of having a strong case and next of presenting that case again and again, from different methods of approach and through the personal championship of a multitude of honest investigators. We venture to assert without qualification that a thorough and honest examination can reach but one verdict, viz., the possession by the Anglican Communion of all that is essential to catholicity and necessary for the well-being of the Christian Church in the work of extending Christ's Kingdom throughout the world and in developing to the very highest degree the individual spiritual life. Those who find this verdict may not care to purchase the treasure at the price demanded, or may cavil because the treasure is held "in earthen vessels." Their witness is valuable, though their attitude towards opportunity is saddening.

Sometimes we are put to quite unnecessary trouble by the unhistorical assertions of those who are guilty of trying to make out a good case for their own position, regardless of the full historical testimony,—an abuse of history which has been explained in an earlier lecture. Here an opening is presented of which hostile controversialists can make damaging use. "If that is all you have to offer in the way of evidence," they quite rightly argue, "then your case is indeed a weak one." And so it is, if evidence must be distorted, perverted, manufactured.

We propose to notice in this lecture some of the foundation facts in the history of our Anglo-catholic Communion which form the solid basis on which its structure rests and which therefore are the objects of misrepresentation and attack. Some suggestions will be made as to the right way of removing misunderstanding and correcting misrepresentation. Church

people should be ready with a pertinent reply and something definite in the way of guidance, when occasion arises.

I. *The Origin and Continuity of the English Church*

If the student has taken to heart some of the warnings uttered in the earlier lectures of the series he will not make the initial mistake so often encountered of neglecting to get the proper historical background and the true perspective for looking at this subject. He will remember that the spread of Christianity was from Jerusalem as a geographical centre and by the agency of Apostles and early members of the Christian body throughout the Roman Empire. He will remind himself that by the highways of commerce and military enterprise Christianity found its way throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world and that for the most part the names of personal pioneers are entirely lacking. He will keep distinctly before him the fact that it is not necessary to find an apostolic founder for the Church in each great centre of population or nation. No one knows who first preached Christianity in Rome or in the important North African Church of Cyprian and Augustine. Likewise no one knows nor is it essential to discover who first introduced Christianity among the Celtic inhabitants of Britain. He will not waste any time over any theories associated with the names of St. Paul or Joseph of Arimathea. The student will produce the documentary evidence for three British Bishops having signed the canons of the Council of Arles in A. D. 314 to show that the Church was among the British inhabitants, with its usual organization under Bishops.[1]

The student will keep before him the political situation, how the Celtic or British occupants of the Islands among whom the Church was planted and widespread were driven to the westward by the invasions and settlement of unchristianized tribes of Angles, Saxons and Jutes and were left deliberately by the evicted settlers in the darkness of heathenism. These invaders are the tribes who became consolidated later into the English people and nation and the history of the Church in England or among English people begins with the Mission of Augustine

from Gregory the Great, is profoundly indebted to another Mission from Ireland primarily and from the Celtic Church located at Iona directly for carrying the christianizing of the English several steps further, but for consolidation and unification looks to Theodore of Tarsus and his work as Archbishop of Canterbury. The Church of England, as a National Church, distinct and self-governing, dates from a council held at Hertford in A. D. 673. Into that the sole organized Christian body among English-speaking people was merged and it absorbed any British and Gallican elements that heretofore had existed and worked in the island.

At and from that critical date the National Church has professed the Catholic Creeds, formed its Liturgy on the basis of Catholic worship, accepted the Canon Law of the Church, Eastern and Western, been governed and administered under the three-fold polity of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and asserted historical and constitutional independence of the State and of any outside court or personal authority. At the same time, in its foundation, early development and establishment the Church in England transcended its insular position. Its first Primate was an Italian monk, Augustine, but consecrated in Gaul by Gallican prelates. Its consolidator, a Greek monk, Theodore, consecrated by an Italian Bishop at Rome, was the strong individuality that determined the allegiance of the island Church to be neither to West or East, but beyond the jurisdiction of Canterbury owning no ultimate authority in the Church except the voice of Christ heard by the power of the Holy Ghost speaking through the collective episcopate of the Apostolic Succession.

Unfortunately several popular fallacies present themselves from time to time to obscure actual history. Sometimes unintelligent zeal is responsible, again superficial understanding of the doctrine and history of the Church, while yet again, sadly enough mere partisan controversy and personal prejudice are to blame.

In the first place, there is an unhistorical and fallacious kind of "Romophobia," or disinclination to admit any connection

whatever at any time between our historical Christianity and the Roman See.[2] That feeling is exhibited by those who endeavor to trace our present English Christianity back to the British or Celtic Church which was organized among the British or Celtic settlers in the territory known as the British Islands between A. D. 200 and 314 when the signatures of British Bishops appear among the signatories of the Council of Arles. This is supposed to give a continuity back to the Gallican Church and so to Asia Minor and St. John and thus to avoid any succession and continuity through the Church in Italy. The case breaks down when we discover that we do not know how or by whom Christianity got among the British and that we are left to pure conjecture until the beginning of the fourth century. This fallacy ignores the facts, that the British Church deliberately would not evangelize the Anglo-Saxon leaders who in the sixth century drove them back to the west side of the island, and that the British Church was gradually absorbed and disappeared in the Church of the consolidated Anglo-Saxon tribes. In the seventh century, to be sure, the Mission from Iona directly, and so indirectly from the British Church in Ireland, did enter and evangelize the Northumbrian Kingdom but the people of the latter were Anglo-Saxons and there was at that time no intermingling with the distinctly different Celtic tribes.

Then the fallacy seeks to work out a Gallican source for all Episcopal Orders because Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury was consecrated Bishop by two Bishops of Southern Gaul. This is true and significant, yet it is not to the point. The line of succession of Bishops from Augustine comes absolutely to an end with Damian and Deusdedit in 664. The British line of Bishops came to an end with Jaruman, so both the lines of transmission from Bishops of Gaul, so to speak, ran out, the technical phrase being *sine prole,* that is, without spiritual children.[3]

With the coming of Theodore to the See of Canterbury we have the transmission of Episcopal Orders through the Bishop of Rome, and with the consecration of Theodore's successor, Brightwald or Bretwald, by Gallican Bishops, we have the double

descent from Gaul and Asia Minor on the one hand and through the Roman episcopate on the other. It made no difference through what sources the succession came so long as it was a valid succession leading back to the Apostles' times. The papal theory had not been formulated and was not set forth as a definite claim until the eleventh century. Hence any assertion that the Mission of Augustine or the Consecration of Theodore by Vitalian, Bishop of Rome, involves coercive jurisdiction is transparently unhistorical. The study of Wilfrid's appeals shows this.

Yet we find recurring from time to time in our Church papers or even in books purporting to be historical the amazing statement that our American Bishops trace back through Augustine to Asia Minor and St. John. It is impossible to show any such thing. Succession in the episcopate comes not from holding the same office, e. g., Archbishop of Canterbury, but by the laying on of hands. Except for extraordinary cases, or the arrangement such as obtains in the American Church to-day whereby a diocesan Bishop may consecrate his Coadjutor who is to succeed him, no Bishop ordinarily consecrates his successor, because he is dead before the latter is chosen and set apart.

That the transmission of episcopal powers and authority through a Bishop of the Roman diocese carries with it thereby jurisdiction or the right to act in a defined territory is an assumption abundantly discredited by precedents that can be adduced, for example, the case of Stephen Langton which repays full examination. That the conferring of the vestment called a Pallium or Pall carried with it jurisdiction is a theory that lands its advocate in a series of historical difficulties quite impossible of solution.[4]

We need not pursue this question further, except to sum up that the Church of the English from its origin onwards developed just as all other sections of the Church in early centuries grew and received Apostolic Succession. The moment it became capable of continuing itself by the possession of an extended episcopate, from that moment dated its independent existence.

II. *The Reformation in England Distinct from the Continental Reformation*

The distinction to be kept in mind constantly in studying the history of men and movements is that *accidental and superficial resemblances do not constitute fundamental identity.* A house of wood and a house of stone skillfully painted to present the appearance of wood cannot be readily distinguished at a glance. There is such a trick as historical camouflage. It has been and is still being employed both by papal and protestant antagonists of English Catholicity, and nowhere with more subtlety than in introducing confusion on the subject of the English Reformation as contrasted with movements on the continent of Europe, approximately contemporaneous, but intrinsically different.

The accidental resemblances between the Lutheran and Calvinistic revolts on the one hand and the readjustments in internal and external relationships of the National Church in England on the other hand are found in the remote cause common to both, the antagonism into which both were brought towards the same usurped authority, and the historic hostility which has been perpetuated.

The common cause was the corruption of the Church system of the day notably as growing out of the assumptions and pretensions of the papal theory and claims. The antagonism was towards any system that disturbed the balance between the individual and the corporate rights as contained and safeguarded in the true doctrine of the Church. The historic hostility resulting was against any attempt to fasten again upon the Church the yoke of papal or State autocracy in matters of religion.

The essential differences which constitute radical dissociation between the two movements are discovered by a study of the purpose, methods and results, immediate and remote.

The purpose of the English movement was to readjust what had become disarranged in the complex parts of the Church's machinery. Such parts were the relations between the National Church and the State, the National Church and the other sections of the Western Church, and the relations between the

Church and the individual. The method employed is to allow the Divine Mechanic Himself to adjust the mechanism which the human agent has misused — to let the Church reform itself by the Holy Ghost within it and in virtue of its being a Divine society. That is the method which on a large and on a small scale has accomplished desirable results repeatedly throughout the Church's career. The results secured were of a nature to commend themselves in the long run — the preservation of the full system of the Church, in Ministry, Sacraments, Creeds, and Worship; the restoration in practice of that which had always been constitutionally recognized, viz., the nationality of the Church, its position as an independent part of the Catholic Church, in no way in allegiance to the Bishop of Rome, and its independence of the State except so far as its temporal possessions and its right relation to the moral well-being of the life of the nation required that Church and State mutually cooperate. Disagreeable personal questions and tyrannical usurpers did introduce unhappy conditions, but the main movement went on steadfastly, not digressing deliberately from the plan for reforms without loss of essentials.

On the other hand, the continental reformers found themselves throwing away what they did not altogether wish to lose, because they were arrogating to themselves the wisdom and power to reform by human means a Divine society. Episcopate, priesthood, every form of corporate authority, sacraments, worship — all had to be surrendered at last. Once lost, recovery of these is all but impossible. When too late to stay the process of throwing overboard the things desirable along with those that are undesirable, the theory has to be found that argues against the value and utility of the lost possessions. So Luther and Calvin, having lost the episcopate and all that depends upon it, evolve their theory of presbyterian government. Having lost the heart of worship, because they have set at naught the Holy Spirit, one of whose offices is to secure the Presence of Christ in His Church, they substitute subjective enthusiasms and cold intellectualism. Having selected certain attributes of God on which unbalanced emphasis is laid, unconvincing and repellent

schemes of salvation, such as justification by faith only and arbitrary election, are set forth as satisfactory. Inevitably, as the centuries elapse, the bald poverty of continental protestantism is exposed, the richness and variety of the Church revealed. The essential divergences of three centuries ago have worked themselves out with relentless completeness at the present day.[5]

One consideration must be noticed which helps to account for the popular failure to make the proper discrimination on the part of those who cling to the fallacy of identity between the continental and English movements. English life was influenced and infected to an important degree by the perversions of doctrine rife on the continent, particularly Calvinism. The unlovely phenomenon of puritanism thus became a factor in English religious life. Thus a foreign element, which the wholesome Anglo-Saxon temperament shrinks back from accepting, has made an effort to get recognition as indigenous to our Christianity and has seriously troubled the balance and normal health of our spiritual life thereby. History makes clear that two methods have been adopted to get rid of the incubus. One method is to throw away vital, supernatural Christianity altogether, thus ridding oneself of an intolerable burden. The other method is to throw oneself heart and soul into the full, joyous hopefulness of the Church's life here and now. Therein will be found no place for the alien principles of puritanism.

III. *Fallacies Concerning the Anglican Communion at the Present Day*

All that has been said in these lectures is intended to be a guide and key to studying and gaining an insight into the Church as it now presents itself before the world. The constructive study of history has for its main purpose the providing of a back-ground for the work and problems of the Church in its advancing career. Religious bodies that have no past or only a brief independent history, such as the Methodists or the bodies that split off from the Church in the sixteenth century, must innovate and experiment. Each innovation and experi-

ment has proved costly, resulting as a rule in the loss of a portion that attaches or refuses to attach itself to the new order. The Anglo-Catholic Communion has a history covering the entire course of the English race in the island kingdom and its extensions. It is not an experiment. Not a problem arises that calls for innovation, only the adaptation and full use of all that the Church possesses in its treasures of catholicity.

To the historical student the following comment of Bishop Creighton, on certain common allegations respecting the National Church of England and applicable to our own Communion, is suggestive.

"We tend, I think, to make too many apologies for the supposed defects of the Church of England, its want of discipline, its absence of positive definition on many points, its large latitude of opinion. To me it seems that the Church of England is the only religious organization which faces the world as it is, which recognizes the actual facts, and works for God in God's own way. . . . The Church of England is rigid in maintaining necessary truth, and is careful to draw the line between what is necessary and what is matter for expediency. . . . The aspirations and ideas of the present in politics, in science, in thought, have no terrors for the Church of England, for its hold of vital truth has never been encumbered by the rubbish of falling scaffoldings and tottering buttresses, which threaten to drag the main building into ruin. The Church of England faces the world as it is, knowing that the world-spirit is strong and operative in many forms, resolute in maintaining God's truth. But it draws a clear line between God's truth and man's means of expressing it, however noble and beautiful they may be. God's truth set forth in accordance with primitive practice, that is the position of the English Church."

Let us voice certain criticisms which conceal illusive and deceptive conceptions of the Church at the present time.

In the first place, it is frequently pointed out with truth that we do not present the aspect of a perfect Church in a sound and healthy condition, and the inference is drawn that therefore our Communion cannot belong to the *Holy* Catholic Church. That

allegation is as old as the sect of the Pharisees in the Jewish religion, as bitterly made in the history of those mischievous impugners of the Church of Augustine's day, the puritan Donatists, and of the earlier times of Cyprian of Carthage when the Montanists held aloof from the Church because its members were not "pure" according to the theory. It has been familiar in English religion from the days of fanatical Cromwell's puritan Independents. Where are these third and fifth and seventeenth century separatists in present-day religion? Have they persisted and lived and accomplished wonders? No, they have disappeared, and the Catholic Church lives. The truth is that the Church and the individual alike are by their human elements imperfect, but "are complete in Him." The Church upon earth will always present this aspect of imperfection. The completion of the Church of human membership consists in union with its Perfect Head in His purifying and perfecting Life. The heavenly Jerusalem is adorned as a Bride for her husband and the Spirit consummates the union.

"We should expect," says a devout writer of keen spiritual insight, "never to find all things to satisfy us in any ecclesiastical arrangement; people who find or imagine such pretty perfection anywhere may soon be worshipping a limited created ideal which is not God, but something that hides Him from them." Honestly and humbly we may confess that we do not find the Threefold Ministry working without short-comings, nor our liturgy "incomparable," nor our parishes unworldly, nor all our communicants deeply spiritual and flawless. Nothing works out entirely to our satisfaction. But that is quite different from admitting that the Church is not adequate to meet every situation and need. The failure to do so lies not upon the Divine side of the Church but upon its human side. Imperfection admitted is the opposite of self-sufficiency.

Quite frequently one encounters the sneer at the bitter partisanship inside the Church. Be at peace amongst yourselves, says some one, before you expect to persuade us. Very popular and plausible and utterly contradicted by experience is this fallacy. Pressed to its necessary conclusion relentlessly it leads

to the solitude which is called peace. Struggle and hostile warfare are not synonymous. The human soul and mind are struggling in a continual battle against external attacks and temptations and internal limitations. Each of us is to "continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant" unto his life's end. We seem to remember quite clearly that among the members of the Twelve there was a strife as to which should be greatest. There was the early Council at Jerusalem to fight through the questions raised by the judaizing party. There comes to mind a part of the early Church where one said, I am of Apollos, another, I am of Cephas, another, I am of Paul, yet another, I am of Christ. Yet points could be cleared up so long as there was no breach of fellowship with the Apostles and no denying the Risen Jesus.

Seventy years ago the Church of England emerged from a superficial peace to the storm of the Catholic Revival. The former was lethargy, the latter the working of vitality. Somewhat more than forty-five years ago the socalled "anti-ritual canon" passed at the Baltimore General Convention seemed to many to threaten the integrity of the Church in the United States. The storm gradually cleared the air and when the clouds dissolved men had a clearer vision and the statute was found to be a mistake and was repealed. Now we have controversies on the Ministry, the Sacraments, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, Reservation of the Sacrament of the Altar, and so on. Other bodies around us are quite free from such disputes. The points under discussion have to do with principles worth struggling for.[6] Where there are no positive, definite principles in religion, there need be, there can be no partisanship. Nothing hinders the entrance upon a state of lethargy. There is nothing to keep one awake.

It is extraordinary to note, but with fear and trembling, that only once for a brief period has the Church in England experienced a schism which carried with it representatives of the Episcopate — the Non-juring Schism of the late seventeenth century, which was for political, not theological reasons. And only once in the history of our American Church has one of its Bishops left the communion of his brother Bishops to set up

another, the "Reformed Episcopal," organization. The crisis turned on an essential point, Regeneration in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, and that was an issue involving the Incarnation and all its consequences.

It would be well for those who are seriously troubled by this fallacy to try to get a clear understanding of St. Paul's assertion, "For this cause there shall be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."

What shall be said as to the general state of loss of intercommunion which is the outstanding phase of the present disunity in Christ's Holy Catholic Church? The subject is too vast for our consideration here and now. The historian remembers that schisms *in* the Church are essentially different from schisms *from* the Church, and he recalls instances of the former occurring quite early and soon healed. As the centuries go by and the Church extends, such breaches are healed more slowly and after longer intervals and in providential ways, rather than by human schemes. Our own Communion has inherited the situation of the separation of the eleventh century between the Greek East and the Latin West, and it was more sinned against than sinning in the breach between the National English Church and the papacy in the sixteenth century. It was the victim of the Lutheran and Calvinistic schism *from* the Western Church in the sixteenth century, and to some extent to blame for perpetuating the conditions which confronted the Wesleys in the seventeenth century. But in truth much has been done already to rectify that for which we may be charged as culpable. The allegation that we acquiesce in this loss of visible unity falls to the ground on examination. But we cannot surrender essentials nor be satisfied with mere negations or outward uniformity.

In conclusion, we may give utterance to a thought which is ever in mind touching the relations of children to their Mother Church. We must not adopt the fallacious attitude of being merely critics of her and her actions. Possibly she does not possess some of those adventitious attractions which are more artificial than natural. Surely she will not disown her own family heritage. Humbly she remains loyal to the "goodness

and mercy that have followed "her all the days of her life. And she cannot divorce herself from her supernatural Bridegroom. We must throw ourselves into her cause heart and soul, as history shows us her sons and daughters whom she loves to honor have done through the centuries. We must live her life, teach her truth, worship her Head, with all our heart and mind and soul and strength. In the language of Hugh James Rose to Newman in 1836, when the latter was already beginning to waver and become the cold critic of the Church of England, "You must let me not *endure,* but love — and warmly and passionately — my Mother Church."

NOTES.

Lecture I.

Note 1. Lane's *Illustrated Notes on English Church History* and Gray's *Early Christianity in Britain* are examples of popular works which take a specious but historically untenable position. The text-books on English History commonly used in schools and prepared for the most part by non-Church writers are examples of prejudiced writing. The Roman Catholics are treated inaccurately also by these writers, but without stirring up the hostility of Roman Catholics because such books attack the English Church and Roman Catholics can correct teaching hostile to themselves in their own schools. Such popular lectures as Gasquet's *Breaking with the Past* exemplify a third faulty and unhistorical method of dealing with the history of the English Church.

Note 2. The following instances of special pleading are typical, the first of indefensible partisanship; the second, of debasing scholarship to "play to the galleries"; the third, the naive sincerity of one on whose mind an exploded fallacy has been indelibly impressed as the truth.

(1) In a paper read by the Rector of one of the largest parishes in one of our largest cities, in 1913, occurs the following passage in an account of the movement towards a consideration, on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, of the question of recognizing the validity of Anglican Orders. The passage is here given as in the "paper", but in the bracketed sections are inserted the names supplied from the current history of the movement, names which the writer either ingenuously or ingeniously omitted, but which, when added, turn the passage into a gross case of *reductio ad absurdum.*

"If Lord Halifax and his friends (names following not mentioned, viz. W. E. Gladstone; Rev. F. W. Puller, author of *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome,* a thorough scholar; Rev. T. A. Lacey and Rev. Edward Denny, joint authors of the *Dissertatio Apologetica de Hierarchia Anglicana,* Mr. Denny being also the author of two treatises of deep scholarship, *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction* and *Papalism;* Rev. William Bright, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Oxford University for many years; the Rt. Rev. John Wordsworth, late Bishop of Salisbury, and probably the most widely read and minutely learned English student of his day; the late Bishop Creighton, a historian of the first rank; Rt. Rev. G. F. Browne, Bishop of Bristol, a student of history and archæology of high standing; and others) had been content to appeal to *scholars of the Protestant Churches or had they been familiar with the history of their own Church* (italics ours) they would not have put themselves in such a humiliating position." Which are we to think of such a controversial method as the above, and the setting of such a statement before a trustful congregation as a fair-minded historical statement? Was it a case of real ignorance or was it a clever partisan trick? There is the dilemma. Certainly the "paper" is not history.

(2) In 1913, the Roman Catholic Abbot (now Cardinal) Gasquet came over from England to give some popular lectures in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, which afterwards were published under the title, *Breaking with the Past.* The author is an able historical student, but that does not prevent him, in discharge of the task laid upon him, of using unhistorical methods quite unworthy of himself, which he would undoubtedly condemn severely in the case of an antagonist. Two short passages are quoted in order to illustrate how a scholar can stoop to unscholarly methods.

"We Catholics further believe and hold that our Lord established this His church upon the authority of St. Peter and his successors, as the necessary basis of unity of faith and discipline. To us this seems so certain that it is inconceivable that our Lord, who was God and had all knowledge of the working of the human heart and mind, should not have provided some such an authority as that of the Pope, as the necessary bond of unity of the Faith. Mind, I am not proving this in any way: I am but stating it as the firm and unchanging belief of Catholics" (page 6). Here is a point of vital importance simply stated and assumed without one word of substantiation, but so as to sweep the argument along with an assumption as a premise which has been fiercely challenged for sixteen centuries. True historical writing would scorn to use such a subterfuge.

Later on Gasquet repeats the familiar statement, so easy to make and so difficult to refrain from making because of its telling effect upon readers or hearers, that the "ordinations of those who had received orders under the Edwardine Ordinal were rejected." This is pure assumption for which no evidence can be produced. In fact the evidence is quite on the other side. But Gasquet knows that not one in a thousand who hear or read him will be able to verify his statement, or will even think it necessary to attempt verification, because they assume his historical honesty. One may examine a careful consideration of the point in Denny's *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*, chapter ix. Another instance of the same kind is found in a note on page 59, where the blunder of calling Richard Hooker, "Bishop," witnesses to the carelessness of the writer. He says, "Bishop Hooker himself admitted the ministration and received the Communion from the hands of Saravia who was a Calvinistic minister." Then as his sole authority he quotes a writer who has no standing as a historian, but who *wishes*, as Gasquet does, the point to be true, and therefore states it as a fact without presenting evidence. The facts are that there is strong evidence of the convergent and cumulative varieties that Saravia had received episcopal ordination, and on the other side the single point that the record of such ordination cannot be found. The adverse point, so far from being exceptional and individual, is a most common occurrence, as episcopal registers were carelessly kept, and often such records were destroyed by fire. It is the kind of argument that if rigidly applied would invalidate hundreds of other cases. Gasquet knows that perfectly well, but he is for the moment just the clever controversialist who wishes to put his opponent in a corner in the eyes of his audience.

(3) Side by side with these two instances from men who really ought to blush to be caught using such palpable tricks, let us quote the refreshingly frank anonymous letter, evidently from a boy of fourteen or fifteen, written with the approbation of his teacher in the parochial school, as certain pencilled corrections seem to indicate. The boy is evidently sure of his major premise but somewhat puzzled

by the practical working of things. The letter was called out by the full and accurate report of a lecture delivered in All Saints Cathedral, Albany, on the subject of Henry VIII and the Church of England:

"Dear Sir: I thought I would inform you that I don't agree with you on the lecture delivered by you at All Saints Cathedral last Thursday, nor do any other Roman Catholics. I think a man in your standing, education and ability who is so highly versed in history and who doesn't know his English history, then he is completely ignorant in the matter of his church. We all know that Henry VIII of England founded the Church of England. This is printed in all the English histories. Why then do you deny it? Do you think the people are fools? Again we know the wicked life Henry led. Why then do you follow the example of such a wicked man? Do you want to be like him? Jesus Christ founded the Catholic faith — 'Thou art Peter, upon this rock I build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' We again know that the Church of England is founded on divorce and if it wasn't for divorce there wouldn't be any Church of England. . . . I once heard of an Episcopal Church in New York, called the Church of St. ———. The members of this church have gone so far as to call themselves American Catholics. When I was last in New York I made it my business to visit it. The only difference between it and us is they do not believe in the Pope and they have their services in English. I asked the lady in the church the name of it. I told her, when she informed me, that I was in the wrong, that I could only believe I was in a Roman Church. . . . It is going pretty far when we can't tell the High church from ours, nor can tell our clergy half the time."

Of these three cases of special pleading one must, I think, vastly prefer this honest little boy.

Note 3. Examples of quasi-historical writing, where the fault is that of "making out a good case for one's own side," are common in the biographies of founders of religious systems, in series of lectures by representatives of diverse denominations to show why each is what he is in religion — Why I am a Baptist, a Methodist, etc. A Congregationalist pastor once gave Bible instructions for a winter on the Acts of the Apostles. His conclusion was a triumphant challenge — "If anyone can find any government in the Acts of the Apostles but congregationalism, I would be glad to have it pointed out." As a matter of fact evidence looking towards several varieties of polity may be found in that book — the papacy, presbyterianism, and episcopacy.

Note 4. The "proof-text" method is an obsession of which few apologists for particular systems or tenets are guiltless. The advocate of the supremacy of the Roman Bishop who quotes the passage — "Thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my Church," finds himself side by side with the Plymouth Brethren who base their rejection of all official ministries upon the passage — "Where two or three are gathered together, there am I in the midst of them;" with the Universalist who gets back eventually to the declarations — "God will have all men to be saved" and "All souls are Mine;" with the Quaker who centres his abandonment of all material and objective and outward things upon St. Paul's words — "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." Every denomination is likely to be discovered guilty of trying a "knock-down argument" upon his opponent. When everything else fails in the effort to deal with such a proof-text or crushing point,

recourse is had to the critical method of throwing doubt upon the authenticity or textual genuineness of the words. It is foolish to stake all on a single witness.

Note 5. Complex evidence is the kind generally necessitated in the work of fixing dates, of investigating the meaning of terms employed, and of deciding questions of authorship. Instances of note where this species of evidence mainly is employed are: the authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse; the chronology of the Synoptists and of the Fourth Gospel bearing upon the day of the Final Passover and the Institution of the Lord's Supper; the date of the document known as *The Teaching of the Apostles;* the authorship of the False Decretals; and the compiler of the Quicunque Vult.

Note 6. Cumulative evidence is employed to build up a case for such points as:— the early rise and rapid spread of the monarchical episcopate in the Christian Church; the early use of creed forms and their scope; the dominant position of the sacramental system; the care taken to safeguard the transmission of the powers and functions of the Christian Ministry from the Apostles' times; the validity of Anglican Orders; the witness against the papal claims; and continuity in essential principles throughout the Christian centuries. Cumulative evidence is likely to increase in volume, on both sides, with the persistent researches of students.

Note 7. Convergent testimony has to be interpreted with caution. The different lines lead in a definite direction but they do not meet actually at definite point so that absolute certainty can be declared. A notable instance is the evidence for the residence of St. Peter in the city of Rome. There is, of course, no definite statement on that matter at all in the New Testament. There is no opposing evidence within or without the New Testament. But the few references to the connection of St. Peter with Rome, while converging towards the fact that he did visit the city, spend some time there, and suffered martyrdom, do not warrant the historian in making such positive statements as Roman Catholic advocates of the papal theory are in the habit of making. Historians in general see no reason for declining to accept his residence in the city, but on any further clear-cut facts they disagree. The following manner of dealing with the matter by so conscientious and thorough a historian as Abbe Duchesne, whose Church History, perhaps for this reason, is on the Index of books prohibited by the Roman See, is probably the utmost that can with accuracy be asserted on the evidence we possess. "Conjectures, built upon foundations too insecure to be sanctioned by history, take the Apostle Peter to Rome during the first years of Claudius (42 A.D.), or even under Caligula (39)." "About the time when St. Paul regained his liberty, St. Peter came to Rome. He had, perhaps, been there before; this is possible, but it cannot be proved." (*The Early History of the Church*, Duchesne, I., 41, 45.) "Ancient and independent witnesses give us the number of twenty-five years, and put it into relationship with the apostleship of St. Peter; but the agreement which they represent as to the actual number ceases when we desire to know exactly to what the number applies. It is therefore wise to suspend our judgment. Moreover, this is all the more necessary because the twenty-five years of the Roman pontificate (i. e. alleged) of St. Peter come into conflict with rather serious difficulties." (*Les Origines Chretiennes*, Duchesne, I., 73.) Compare this caution on the part of a true historian with the present Roman Catholic assertion, ratified by Pius IX, that St. Peter acted as Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. Prob-

ably this statement, ratified by a Pope, is one of the "serious difficulties" to which Duchesne refers. No wonder his books are on the Index.

Convergent evidence, if the only kind available, can seldom arrive at more than a possibility, not at a strong probability, as is the case with cumulative testimony. The questions of Swedish and Moravian continuity in episcopal succession are limited almost entirely to convergent evidence.

Note 8. Corroborative evidence is the reward of turning on the side-lights to illuminate the historical scene. Modern research makes great use of such testimony. Contemporary literature, e. g. Dante's poems, Shakespeare's plays, furnish not source material but illuminating comments and suggestions. Diaries, such as those of Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn (both included in Everyman's Library) richly repay reading by the student of the period dealt with. From corroborative evidence, however, unrelated to definite assertions, no deduction can safely be made. E. g. it would not be valid to estimate the character of Oliver Cromwell from references in Evelyn's Diary and Scott's *Woodstock.*

Additional Note.

A warning needs to be given against confusing "special pleading" and "making out a good case" with the presuppositions with which students approach subjects under examination. Granted only that the investigator uses a scientific method, is honest, and takes into full consideration all the evidence, on every side, the thesis with which he sets out does not necessarily color and determine his conclusions. For the sake of illustrating this point, we may refer to three scholars of the highest rank — Duchesne, Harnack and Ramsay — each starting in on historical investigation with his own personal presuppositions as to the value of the traditional view on credibility and reliability of New Testament and early uninspired Christian writers. The Abbe Duchesne presupposes that the traditional dates and authors are correct in the main and finds much to substantiate his assumption. Ramsay, as he tells us himself, set out on his line of investigation, assuming that St. Luke, if the writer of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, was not an accurate and trustworthy historian. A complete reversal of his assumption was the result. Harnack, ignoring tradition, makes an independent investigation, using all available material in a most thorough, skillful, yet fair-minded method. The result has been a gradual and deliberate approximation to the traditional positions on dates and authorship of documents which is of deep significance. Honest research under a true method with the avowed intention of securing accurate results is always welcomed by students in the subject of history.

Lecture II.

Note 1. The history of controversy indicates that lack of teaching or unbalanced and unguarded teaching opens up a fissure through which all at once a strong flood of error will burst. E. g. The error of Arius gained headway through failure to distinguish between the existence of Father and Son under eternal conditions, while human father and son exist under temporal and known conditions. The Nestorian error is always liable to precipitate a controversy if the uniqueness of the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth are not clearly taught, as

keeping them from being included in possible human experience. The controversy assumes seriousness suddenly, but has gathered force long before.

Note 2. Matters of discipline may be closely bound up with doctrine so as to necessitate the permanence of the disciplinary regulation. Historical instances are found in the Paschal Controversy, the Eastward Position of the Celebrant, the requirement of communicating at Easter or on a minimum of appointed occasions, and in other familiar cases.

Note 3. The celibacy of the clergy has been made quasi-doctrinal with the Roman Communion. In the Eastern Communion the regulations require parish priests to be married and Bishops to be taken from the monks who are, of course, unmarried or widowers. The Anglican Communion has no discipline on the subject but a statement and recommendation. Comparing the uses of these three sections of the Church with the history of celibacy shows that the question is one of discipline, and that circumstances may indicate the need of enforcing or relaxing the discipline.

Note 4. The fallacy of staking everything upon the writings and teaching of a group of theologians lies in the fact that such a group is a witness, not a source of doctrine. Neither the New Testament writers, nor the Apostolic Fathers, nor the Great Doctors, nor the Fathers of the first five centuries, nor the post-Reformation writers, nor the Oxford and Cambridge Schools, any more than the "Caroline Divines" can be appealed to as authorities to settle disputes which may not have been before them in their day at all.

Note 5. The case for the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession rests upon evidence of every kind. The balancing of evidence shows an overwhelming weight in favor of the doctrine. There are, however, pieces of evidence on the other side. And there is available no such easy demonstration and mathematical proof as many seem to think ought to be forthcoming. But in this respect Apostolic Succession is not an isolated case. "Emphasis on the Apostolic Succession emerges in history at the same crises and under pressure of the same danger as emphasis on the Apostolic Scriptures and on the Apostolic Creed. These made the three-fold cord which secured the hold of second century Christians upon their Apostolic origin." (C.H.H. Turner.) One who studies carefully Gore's *The Church and the Ministry*, Hamilton's *The People of God*, *The Early Church and the Ministry*, edited by Swete, Mason's *Episcopacy*, and Lightfoot's *Dissertation on the Ministry* and his other writings bearing on the subject, will be able to marshal and balance the historical attestation to the statement at the beginning of the Preface to the Prayer Book Ordinal.

Note 6. Other illustrations are found in the Iconoclastic Controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries, perpetuated and periodically renewed because of confusion between *latria* and *dulia*, or as we might employ the terms between *adoration* and *veneration*, cf. an excellent explanation in the Century dictionary under the word, *dulia;* the Sunday observance question which goes back to the distinction between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian First Day as the memorial of the Resurrection; Regeneration in Holy Baptism, controversies concerning which arise generally from confusion as to regeneration, conversion, and sanctification.

Note 7. One widespread and radical misconception of the Church is bound up in the mistaking means for ends. The Catholic position is that the Church is the home for sinners; the puritan conception which has largely become the prevailing popular conception is that the Church is a museum of saints. Another

instance: all significant and symbolical ceremonial is an expression to the eye and through the body of worship due to God alone. The narrow-minded idea that a Church service characterized by minute attention to all details of correct ceremonial is an end, and the opposite bigotry that such a service is wicked or idolatrous, both have the same underlying error. Again, poverty is not a virtue in itself, nor wealth a vice, for the former may be due to sloth and the latter the result of diligent and laudable stewardship of talents.

Note 8. The number of controversies on a small scale is large where the divergence turns upon the translation of a passage in the Bible while the study of the words in the original would have afforded accuracy. Doubtless many disputes about the question of priest as a proper title for the second Order of the Ministry have arisen from the assumption that *priest* represents *sacerdos* and hence must lead to sacerdotalism, while *presbyter* translates *presbuteros* and means *elder*, forgetting that "new priest is old presbyter writ short." How numerous are the discussions over the clause in the Apostles' Creed — "He descended into hell" — because the word, hell, in the English version, is taken to refer to the state of torment of the everlastingly lost, instead of representing the word, Hades.

Note 9. A series of controversial discussions, worth studying as an illustration of the method of confutation, appeared in the Church in the United States recently from the pens of able writers: *The Issues Before the Church*, by Bishop Kinsman, answered by Dr. G. C. Foley in *The Real Issue Before the Church*, which in turn was ably confuted by Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., in *Two Fundamental Principles of the Anglican Reformation.* The pamphlets on the Kikuyu Case and between Bishop Gore, Dr. Sanday, Dean Strong and others on the supernatural facts of the Creed, are other present-day examples of protracted controversy.

Note 10. The importance of definition of terms cannot be overestimated. Any working definition may be taken at the outset and tested, then restated, but all must agree to use the same term in the same sense. Before the first clashing of swords should be the demand,— What do you mean by such and such a term? Often there will then be no duel.

Note 11. Episcopacy must be carefully dissociated from the idea of prelacy which the puritans read into the term, from worldly wisdom which characterized the statesman-Bishops in the Middle Ages, from a mere dignity as in the case of Renaissance Bishops, and from mere superintendency, as in the case of the officers called Bishops among Methodists, Moravians, Lutherans, and Danish bodies. The corporate authority of the Episcopate is not represented by these types.

Note 12. Much ingenuity has been displayed in attempts to fit the definition of the term, sacrament, in the Prayer Book Catechism into the other Sacraments. It is not necessary to do so. The definition was framed to describe the two Sacraments further considered. Cf. *The Church Catechism*, Newbolt, page 292.

Note 13. The two divergences from the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, one or both of which will usually be discovered at the root of all attacks upon or misunderstanding of objective worship, are Nestorianism, the error that two Persons, as well as two Natures exist in conjunction in the Incarnate One — a human person and a Divine Person; and Pelagianism, the error that supernatural help or "grace" is not needed by all men. The former leaves us no Divine Person present with the Church to be adored, the latter makes the human person only an example without power to work in us. Cf. *The Age of the Fathers*, Bright, Vol. II, chapter XXXIII.

Note 14. The following books on Authority in religion are recommended: *Authority in the Church,* T. B. Strong; *Authority, Biblical and Ecclesiastical,* F. J. Hall; *The Place of Authority in Religious Belief,* V. H. Stanton; *Divine Transcendence,* Illingworth.

Note 15. The root-errors underlying the majority of the historical Separatist bodies are traceable to a defective grasp upon the full doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Holy Ghost in the Church. The conscientious parish priest will find it advisable to re-study or re-read standard treatises on each of these subjects frequently. Books recommended with this end in view are: *The Divinity of Our Lord,* Liddon; *The Incarnation,* Eck; *The Incarnation of the Son of God,* Gore; *The Doctrine of the Incarnation,* Wilberforce; *The Incarnation,* F. J. Hall; *The Holy Spirit in the N. T.,* and *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church,* Swete; *The Operations of the Holy Spirit,* Ewer; *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost,* Henry J. Manning; *The Holy Spirit* and *I Believe in the Holy Ghost,* Masterman; *The Office and Work of the Holy Ghost,* Hutchings.

Note 16. It is not sufficiently recognized by controversialists that scientific and historical theology has its technical terms which it adopted from a general or literary use, fixing upon them distinct theological meanings. The same terms have often passed into a third stage, as shibboleths or cant terms, gradually emptied of definite significance. Instances of words or terms which have passed through these stages are: *salvation, grace, truth, faith, sacrament, catholic, conversion, regeneration.* The interpertation of source-documents, including the books of the Bible and "ancient authors," is a most important matter. Many of the biblical commentaries are considered unpractical because they discuss minutely the sense in which some of the terms above mentioned are employed by particular writers, yet such study and conclusions are of the utmost importance.

Note 17. The point here emphasized is illustrated by comparing the controversial treatises of St. Augustine of Hippo with the constructive work of St. Thomas Aquinas; or Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* with Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed;* or treatises on *The Thirty Nine Articles* with Hall's *Anglican Summa.* Controversial works need to be supplemented, or better still, preceded by constructive treatises.

Note 18. The permanent value of a *catena* of authorities or quotations is to exhibit what can be said on each side of a question by the appeal to witnesses, and to prevent sweeping and unguarded generalizations. The probability of one side or another being the stronger is dealt with in other ways than by the mere number or length of quotations.

Note 19. The danger is grave that controversy will degenerate into vilifying personalities or the bitter obstinacy of prejudice. In connection with such liability it is well to remember (1) that it may be assumed with considerable reasonableness that the party in the controversy that resorts to such methods has the weaker case; (2) that sympathy generally swings towards the side of the object of personal attack; (3) that there are certain methods which a Christian and gentleman will feel precluded from adopting. Neither is the method of ridicule likely to convince. Cf. The Martin Marprelate Tracts, "Sion's Plea against Prelacy," Kingsley's "What, then, does Mr. Newman Mean?," and many modern controversial tracts.

Note 20. The germ of every controversy may usually be found in some unsupported and untenable premise assumed boldly on the one hand and passed over without examination on the other hand; or even more frequently in the bringing forward of some analogy or metaphor or other illustration and over-working such by assuming it to be a complete and absolute parallel, or controverting its relevance because it does break down if pressed too far. Instances notable in the history of controversy are: the Arian assumption that the relation between human father and son was a parallel for explaining and stating Divine relationships; the "Branch theory" as adequately accounting for the three great Catholic Communions,— Anglican, Eastern, and Roman — being separate entities. yet One Church; assumptions that the Jewish Church and the Christian Church are analogous to one another so that arguments concerning the Ministry, authority, rites and ceremonies, codes of morals may be based on such premises, while no one exposes the fallacy by showing that the possession of certain common points is offset by the presence of essential differences. For a very recent example of an untenable premise calmly assumed and pressed, reference is made to a sentence in the late Dean Hodges' Dudleian Lecture on *The Validity of Non-Episcopal Ordinations*, as follows: "Christ planted his gospel in the souls of men, and it grew into the church. He contributed the initial inspiration of his personality and his message, and the men whom he inspired did the rest." This assumption cannot be permitted to pass as tenable, for it ignores the Presence of God the Holy Ghost in the Church. A rule never to be disregarded in historical work is, Examine the premises. An untenable premise destroys the syllogism. A doubtful premise, even if coupled with a sound premise, cannot lead to a safe conclusion.

Note 21. The negative results from controversy may be illustrated by reference to the oft-tried plan of "getting together" on the part of the different religious bodies for a symposium where a representative of each tells with much earnestness and unction — Why I am a Baptist, a Congregationalist, an Episcopalian, *et cetera.* The famous Pitts Street Chapel Lectures in Boston constituted one of the earliest attempts of this kind in the United States. There seem never to be any conversions from one body to another as a result. Rather, the effect is much as W. S. Gilbert puts the outcome in the libretto of an operetta — "I am right and you are right, and all are right." The explanation is that each assumes the premises necessary for drawing the desired conclusion.

Lecture III.

Note 1. It is never safe to assume the inerrancy of any writer, historical or doctrinal, constructive or controversial. A phrase of Athanasius led Cyril of Alexandria to repeat it in another controversy in which the words gained a dangerous signification. St. Thomas Aquinas assumed the genuineness of certain documents purporting to witness to the early recognition of the pre-eminence of the Roman See. These documents having been proved spurious and forgeries the conclusions of the Angelic Doctor based upon them require modification. Richard Hooker, Bishop Andrewes, and Archbishop Laud faced a new situation, consequent upon the Lutheran and Calvinist schisms. Hence they stand too near the movements to consider them in the proper perspective.

Note 2. The method which this fallacy frequently employs is, to argue that abnormal situations, if recurring several times, constitute an ordinary standard or norm. For instance, at the conclusion of the war when parochial activities were resumed in a certain country of the Anglican Communion a priest argued that as during the war Chaplains had administered the Holy Communion to those who were unconfirmed and to those who were members of alien communions, also that the Celebration was often in the evening, these practices were henceforth lawful and right. All these were abnormal practices in abnormal times. Nevertheless the conclusion reached was that the Church might normally and under ordinary circumstances celebrate in the evening and communicate people indiscriminately.

Note 3. All careful historians take heed themselves and warn others concerning the tendency to coin phrases or terms and then to use them as a kind of colored historical spectacles through which all events become tinted with the phrase or term. The historical order is inverted. The principle or office or series of events precedes the description. The fallacy lies in assuming the opposite to be the case. An example may be adduced from the term, "supremacy," as applied to papal claims. "We must not be misled," writes Canon Dixon in his History of the Church of England, "by the term, 'supremacy,' which first began to be applied to the papal power in England after that power had been taken away . . . I question whether the word, 'supremacy,' is ever applied to the papal jurisdiction by those who lived under it and by those who abolished it." (Vol. I, 58, footnote.) This fallacy is a form of anachronism.

Lecture IV.

Note 1. The unhistorical nature of the papal claims necessitated the formulation of the Roman theory of Development which is characterized by the introduction of alien factors, by the *petitio principii*, and by the "vicious circle." In following the argument of controversial writings close watch should be kept to discover such subterfuges.

Note 2. Instances of syllogisms in which continuity or the lack of it is a premise are as follows: (*a*) the assumption that the Church organization began towards the close of the first century, which, if true, reduces the Ministry, Sacraments and essentials of belief to human authority. Writers in all ages from Porphyry and Celsus to our own day use this assumption in some form against the Divine institution and constitution of the Church. It is refuted, or at least shown to be gravely doubtful, by a study of the writers who bridge over the alleged gap between A. D. 68 and 110, viz., St. John the Apostle, Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and later writers on the period who claim to base their information on sources now lost. (*b*) *Per contra*, the assumption of complete organic and supernatural continuity between the Church on the Day of Pentecost and the Post-Apostolic Age, thus connecting all that has ever been held essential by the Church, in Ministry, Creeds, and Sacraments, with the revelation complete and final at Pentecost, and bound up with the truth of Christ present with His Church, the Church as His mystical Body, and the continuous, indwelling presence of God the Holy Ghost as His unique temporal Mission from the Ascended Christ. (*c*) The assertion that the English Church to-day is continuous with the Church of the Apostolic Age in all essentials; or the contrary, that it began with Henry

VIII, in 1534, demands a careful investigation of events, documents, and formularies. It is entirely legitimate to demand the date for the ending of the old and the beginning or re-founding of a new religion. If such cannot be given the premises in the latter case becomes unsupported assertion, quite valueless, and the burden of proof belongs to those who negative continuity.

Note 3. The exhaustiveness of this classification may be illustrated from physical light. *White,* which is the totality of the form of energy which we call light, may be taken as parallel to *catholic; black,* or the absence of all color, to *non-Christian;* between the two lies the entire series of prismatic colors, endless in possibility of combination, but always shading off from pure white through the lack of some part of the essential energy of full and perfect light. Our Lord suggests the analogy in His words, "I am the Light of the world."

Note 4. This value assigned to the episcopate of apostolic succession indicates not that the possession of the episcopate is an end but the medium and instrument whereby the "deposit" of truth is safeguarded and transmitted, not the source of vitality, but the channel of life for the Church. Probably the noblest summing up of the witness of the episcopate is in the words of Dean Church: "In what we believe and hold about (the Episcopate) we do not depend upon results but on the word of Christ; but His word is not in vain and cannot be fruitless. We have a promise; have we an answering history? We believe that we have. The idea of our Ordinal has not failed. History is indeed but too full of many a grim irony about it. It tells of great errors as well as of great achievements. But there has been ample to justify the persistent hold which the institution of Episcopacy has kept on the Church. . . . In looking back on what on the whole has come of all this in the history of religion the first thing that strikes us is the part which the Episcopate has had in keeping up the continuity and identity of the Christian society. . . And that which has kept on from age to age the sense of the oneness of the continuous Christian body is, I cannot doubt it, the unfailing presence of the Episcopate." (Pascal and other sermons, page 105.)

Note 5. "There has grown up, under the influence of our evolutionary modes of thought, and in connection with the comparative study of religions a tendency to put the human initiative in place of the divine, the search for God in place of His revelation. . . . The sacramental system of the Church brings this divine initiative both symbolically and actually home to us. And pre-eminently the Eucharist sums up the fact that from first to last we are in the hands of God. . . .

"In saying all this we are not denying that religion has existed and may exist independently of sacraments; we merely affrm that the system of the Christian Church is normally sacramental, and that sacraments, when rightly used, so far from materializing things spiritual, spiritualize material things. And herein is their special value." (Illingworth, *Divine Transcendence,* pp. 143, 150.)

"There was a time, early in the Church's history, when the Manichæan view of matter, as intrinsically evil, led to the docetic heresy, which regarded the Incarnation as phantasmal, or apparent, and not real, in order to preserve the divine dignity from supposed contamination. And we meet with similar modes of thought in the present day. 'Spiritual' is not infrequently assumed to be synonymous with 'immaterial,' and various fallacies arise from this mistake.

Spiritual religion, it is supposed, must be, as far as possible, independent of material conditions. Or again, the Resurrection is regarded as a spiritual fact, the question of whose material counterpart is unimportant. In the same way a severance is made between the historical Jesus of Nazareth and the divine idea. Or by a still more fundamental error the Incarnation is totally rejected, on the ground that the Infinite could not manifest itself, at a point of time, in a historical Person and historical events.

"But all these opinions, like their kindred heresy of old, ignore the fact that the Incarnation inaugurated a new epoch in our whole philosophy of matter. For it not only revealed God to man, but also man to Himself. . . . Matter viewed in its spiritual context is seen to be of infinite significance as the natural and normal instrument of God in dealing with men. And the Incarnation is the palmary instance of this. The whole subsequent history of the Church is, *ipso facto*, a standing proof of the illimitable potency with which this single event was charged. To say that God acts and speaks through matter, or through history, is, of course, to say that He acts and speaks through a changing medium, each of whose successive moments supersedes the last. But the moments, so regarded, are no mere transitory phases; for each will have given expression to a meaning that endures. The voice dies away, but there remains the word, which but for the voice would never have been uttered. And the essence of the Incarnation, if one may so speak, is that it was no mere allegory, no mere 'truth embodied in a tale'; but truth acted out in history; under the strain of the wilderness, the pressure of Gethsemane and Calvary; and by that action realized forever.

"Accordingly the sacraments have been called extensions of the Incarnation. And they may well be so termed. For they continue its principle. They bring the Incarnation home to us. They convey to those who use them faithfully, God's grace or free gift; with the authority that comes from above and bespeaks our reverence and awe, and the assurance and actuality that material enactment affords. And by so doing, they give a sacramental character to the whole of life; for they teach us to look for and therefore to find, among the temporal things that are seen, steps that lead onward and upward to the unseen things that are eternal." (Illingworth, *Christian Character*, pp. 152–154.)

Lecture V.

Note 1. The following passages from writers, non-Christian and outside of New Testament times, substantiate the "historicity" of Christ, excepting at the hands of destructive critics who will be found to assume somewhere in their premises what they wish to prove, viz., that Christianity has no foundation in fact.

(a) The historian Tacitus (A. D. 55–119), writing his *Annals* in 115, asserts as historian, not as reporter, "Christ, the founder of this (Christian) name, had been put to death during the reign of Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate."

(b) Suetonius the historian (A. D. 70–160), writing his life of Claudius in 120 has the statement: "Claudius expelled from Rome the Jews, who were in a state of tumult, incited thereto by one Chrestus." Cf. Acts xviii. 2. This passage refers to the riots resulting from the preaching about the Christ at Rome as "another emperor, Jesus." The mistake in transliterating the title from Greek to

Latin is referred to by Tertullian; and is apparently alluded to by Tacitus, according to the latest revision of his manuscript.

(c) The following extract from the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus (A.D. 37–105), which has been kept in the background because of allegations of critical scholars, has recently under a renewed scrutiny been credited with a positive evidential value. Cf. An article by F. C. Burkitt (Cambridge), "Josephus and Christ," from the Theologische Tijdschrift, 1913.

"Now about this time came Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one may call Him a man, for He was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive what is true with pleasure, and he attracted many of the Jews and many of the Greeks; this was 'the Christ.' And when on the accusation of the principal men among us Pilate had condemned him to the cross, they did not desist who had formerly loved him (for he appeared unto them on the third day alive again, the divine prophets having foretold this and a myriad of other wonderful things about him), and even now the race of those called 'Christians' after him has not died out."

The doubts about the passage arise from dogmatic considerations solely. The conjecture has been advanced that the passage is an interpolation because it appears to assert that Jesus was the Christ and that He rose from the dead. From the eighteenth century many have assumed it to be incredible that Josephus could say this.

"Some unorthodox critics have thought the testimony too definite to be genuine, and some orthodox critics have thought it too good to be true." An unprejudiced examination of the passage perceives that Josephus, the non-Christian who had also abandoned his relation to Judaism, is not conceding what the Christians claim, but rather making a clever hit at their Founder. He is practically saying: Let us suppose that your Founder was the Messiah of the Jews and even did work some wonders. Nevertheless your religion is a failure and is proved harmless, for it has not resulted in the overthrow of the Roman Empire, and is not even a rival power. The passage is thus not a faint approach to the articles of the Christian Creed, but its witness is incidentally strong to the historicity of Jesus. Cf. *The Credibility of the Gospel,* Batiffol, pp. 1–17.

Note 2. Cf. a useful examination of the early witness — *The Historic Episcopate,* by the late Prof. J. H. Barbour, edited by Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., and reissued by the Church Missions Publishing Co., Hartford, Conn. Fuller examination and treatment are to be found in the latest edition of Gore's *The Church and The Ministry,* with notes by C. H. H. Turner, and *The Early History of The Church and The Ministry,* edited by Dr. Swete.

Not until the sixteenth century movements, under Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, had lost the episcopate did discredit begin to be advanced against the necessity of the episcopate for purposes of transmitting ministerial power and authority.

Note 3. The scope of Bishop Lightfoot's *Essay on the Christian Ministry* has been misunderstood. Hence the resultant misinterpretation. The essay is an historical examination of the evidence of the rise of the Three-fold Ministry, not a doctrinal consideration. Nevertheless the essay, read along with passages in other writings of Bishop Lightfoot, does imply the doctrine. Cf the Preface to the third edition of Canon Maccoll's Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals, pp. xxiv–xxxvii. The conclusion of that portion of the Preface is significant: "I had the privilege," writes Canon Maccoll, "of spending some days with the Bishop at

Auckland Castle, and he then told me that the study of the early records of Christianity had left no doubt whatever in his mind as to the Apostolic — which, in fact, meant the Divine — origin of Episcopacy, although with that large charity and gentleness which characterized him, he would not presume to pass any judgment on Christian communities differently organized."

On the subject of The Apostolic Succession in the book of essays edited by Dr. Swete, mentioned above, Mr. Turner writes: "Emphasis on the Apostolic Succession emerges in history at the same crisis and under pressure of the same danger as emphasis on the Apostolic Scriptures and on the Apostolic Creed. These made the three-fold cord which secured the hold of second century Christians upon their apostolic origin; if their right to it was established, they and they alone were the authorized representatives of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the world, and the Body of which they were members was the only adequate vehicle of His teaching and expression of His Spirit." (The Early History of the Church and the Ministry, p. 96.)

Lecture VI.

Note 1. The English Church is prior to the English State. The following passage from *The History of England from the Earliest Times to the Norman Conquest*, by T. Hodgkin (Quaker), is the conclusion of an unprejudiced historian of the first rank who had no brief for either the English Church or the papacy. "From this brief review of the relations of the various English kingdoms to one another towards the close of the seventh century, it will be abundantly evident how far we were yet from anything like national unity. There does not seem to be any dawning feeling of fellowship of race. Angle wages with Angle and Saxon with Saxon a long embittered warfare; and more than once a Mercian or West Saxon king avails himself of British (i. e. Celtic, not Anglo-Saxon) help to win the victory over his kinsfolk. If Anglo-Saxon unity was at length attained — and we know it was not until far into the tenth century that it was even approximately realized — this result was undoubtedly due to two great causes: the influence of the national Christian Church, and the necessity of self-defense against the Scandinavian invaders. With the first of these causes alone we have to deal. It cannot be doubted that zeal for their new-born Christian faith was in some measure already drawing the English kings together. When Oswald of Bernicia stood sponsor for West-Saxon Kynegils, when his brother Oswy persuaded East-Saxon Sigebert to forsake the follies of idolatry, a moral bond of union was formed, which might be developed into political relationship. The consciousness of common interest in the kingdom of God might well become, and eventually did become, a consciousness of fellow-citizenship in one great country." (p. 179.)

The corollary to the priority of the English Church over the State is, that the State did not "establish" the Church. It is not a "State Church" historically. According to Lord Selborne the jurist and Lord Chancellor of Mr. Gladstone's premiership, "The establishment of the Church by law consists essentially in the incorporation of the law of the Church into that of the realm, as a branch of the general law of the realm (though limited as to the causes to which and the person to whom it applies); in the public recognition of its courts and judges, as having proper legal jurisdiction; and in the enforcement of the sentences of those courts (when duly pronounced according to law) by the civil power. The 'establishment' (so understood) of the Church of England grew up gradually and silently, out

of the relations between moral and physical power natural in an early stage of society; *not as the result of any definite act, compact, or conflict, but so that no one can now trace the exact steps of the process by which the voluntary recognition of moral and spiritual obligation passed into custom, and custom into law.*"

Note 2. The obsession which has seized upon the minds of certain champions of Anglican independence that to admit the transmission of ministerial power through the Bishop of Rome is to concede the papal claims exhibits an imperfect acquaintance with the facts. There never was any clear cut theory of the papacy formulated until the times and episcopate of Gregory VII, Hildebrand. The whole case for the papacy as presented by modern controversialists consists in the method of reading a theory back into the facts — a combination of the logical errors of the vicious circle and begging the question, coupled with a use of forgeries and interpolations, all of which may be studied profitably in Mr. Denny's *Papalism.* Those who have to traverse the devious ways of Roman Catholic claims will do well to note that, in almost every argument advanced, one or both of the premises will be found to be doubtful in a greater or less degree. From doubtful premises only doubtful conclusions can be drawn. The assumption that true jurisdiction of Bishops has always been recognized as inherent in the occupant of the Roman See has so many facts witnessing against it that there need be no hesitation at all in calmly stating that Augustine was sent to the Anglo-Saxons by Gregory and that Theodore was consecrated by Vitalian, the Roman Bishop.

Note 3. That the transmission of the episcopate could not have come down from Augustine of Canterbury who was consecrated by Gallican Bishops probably tracing back their Orders to Asia Minor is certain. The facts may be studied in Stubbs' *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum,* Bainbridge Smith's *English Orders,* or Dr. Waterman's *Tables of Episcopal Descent.* The statement and table frequently brought forward to show that the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Presiding Bishop of the American Church traces his episcopal lineage back to Asia Minor and the Apostle St. John are historically untenable.

Some of the significant facts bearing on the early English Succession are succinctly stated in the following extracts from the writings of an entirely trustworthy historian — Rt. Rev. George Forrest Browne:

"When the last of the Italian Mission, Archbishop Honorius, died, there were only four Bishops in England. Two of these, Rochester and Dunwich, had the Canterbury Consecration; the other two had not. Agilbert of Dorchester had been consecrated by French Bishops, and the Celtic Finan of Lindisfarne by Irish Bishops. During the vacancy after Honorius' death, Cedd of London was consecrated by the Celtic Finan and two Bishops called in by him — Scotic Bishops, no doubt. The next Archbishop of Canterbury, Deusdedit, was consecrated by the Bishop of Rochester alone, and he himself consecrated only one Bishop. The next nine of the Bishops of England, from 655 to 668, were all consecrated either by French, Scotic, or British Bishops, not one of them from Canterbury. Perhaps nothing could more graphically indicate the low ebb to which the Roman Mission had sunk, or more clearly emphasize the fact that the English Church, or the Church of England, was left to go its own way, without the intervention of Rome. The independent position may have been very bad for the Church, but of the fact of its independence there can be no manner of doubt. This was exactly in accord with the wise lines on which Gregory the Great drew its national constitution.

As Gregory called it in its earliest infancy 'the Church of the English,' *Anglorum Ecclesia*, so Bede called it in its fully developed state, 'the holy Church of the English Race,' *sancta ecclesia gentis Anglorum.* Never did the word or the idea 'Rome' come into the name of the national Church." (Browne, Theodore and Wilfrith, p. 7–9.)

"Theodore was consecrated by Vitalian (Bishop of Rome) himself on Sunday, March 26, 668. . . . He was the first Archbishop of Canterbury, and the first Bishop for England consecrated by a Bishop of Rome. The next archbishop so consecrated was Richard, consecrated at Anagni by Alexander III in 1174, *after an interval of more than five hundred years.* Then, in 1207, Langton was consecrated at Viterbo by Innocent III; Boniface of Savoy at Lyons by Innocent IV in 1245; Peckham at Rome by Nicholas III in 1279 . . . five in all in thirteen hundred years, and four of them in one hundred and five years. Since 1279 no one has been consecrated directly to the archbishopric of Canterbury by a Bishop of Rome. Archbishop Chichele was consecrated in 1408 to the bishopric of St. David's by Gregory XII — Pope or Anti-Pope, who can really say?" (op. cit. pp. 85–6.)

Note 4. The history of the Pall or Pallium. Whatever Gregory may have meant by it, it is quite clear that he meant something different from what Paschal II or Leo XIII would mean by it, and that the thing was in his day (so far as the West was concerned) a novelty of little more than a century in age. . . . (1) The giving of the pallium had its origin in a grant of insignia to great people, ecclesiastics or others, by the civil power. (2) This existed in the East, at any rate as an occasional thing, long before it did in the West. (3) The pallium itself corresponds very closely with the omophorion which has always been worn by bishops in the East, and is found as early as the beginning of the fourth century. (4) Thence it passed to certain bishops in the West who were closely related to the East, such as those of Rome, Ravenna, and Ostia. These in all probability received it from the Emperor himself . . . the pallium in the West was always regarded as a mark of personal dignity. . . . (5) Gradually the Bishops of Rome began to give it to certain other bishops as a mark of honor. At first, and indeed down to the time of Gregory the Great himself, they used to obtain permission of the emperors before making the gift of the pallium. (6) In Gregory's own day it was given to quite distinct classes of persons, and with a different signification, e. g. to certain bishops as a matter of custom, probably originally by imperial grant; to certain great bishops who had been appointed vicars of the Roman See, to represent its interests, as in the case of The Archbishop of Arles, or as a mark of special favor of which the gift to Augustine of Canterbury is an instance. (7) All metropolitans did not receive it from the Roman Bishop, and metropolitans who had not received it exercised their metropolitan functions just as those who had. Laurentius and Mellitus, successors of Augustine, did not receive it. (8) Although Gregory writes that he confers the pallium to be used "in the solemnities of the Mass" yet he seems to have in his mind a connection with the consecrating of suffragans. (9) The first direct statement that the pallium is necessary is in the pontificate of Nicholas I, who in reply to a question declares that it is not lawful for a metropolitan to be enthroned or to consecrate before he has received the pallium. It is a case of long and very gradual growth to the later claim that with the pallium was conferred the *plenitudo pontificalis officii.*

(Beginnings of English Christianity, Appendix F (condensed); Collins.)

Note on the Terms Catholic and Protestant.

I. Catholic.

"In the West a treatise by Nicetas of Remesiana shows that since, at any rate, the end of the fourth century this word has formed part of the description of the Church in the Apostles'Creed. . . . The word 'Catholic' is used as descriptive of the Church in one of the Epistles of St. Ignatius at the beginning of the second century ('Wheresoever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church'). An examination of the context shows that the term there includes the idea of the true Church throughout the world in communion with the bishops in contrast to particular bodies of Christians, and the idea of the true Church as contrasted with heretical sects not in communion with the bishops. Thus the passage suggests both the notion of universality and the notion of orthodoxy." (*The Christian Church*, Darwell Stone, pp. 135–6.)

A famous passage in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (A. D. 315–386) is as follows: "The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout all the world from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to the knowledge of men concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it brings into subjection to godliness the whole race of mankind, governors and governed, learned and ignorant; and because it treats and heals every class of sins that are committed in soul and body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and in words and in every kind of spiritual gift. . . . Since the word 'Ecclesia' is applied to different things . . . and since one might truly say that there is an 'Ecclesia' of evil doers in the meetings of the heretics . . . for this cause the Faith has securely deliverd to thee the Article, 'And in One Holy Catholic Church,' that thou mayest avoid their detestable meetings, and ever abide in the Holy Catholic Church in whom thou wast regenerated. And if ever thou art sojourning in cities, inquire not simply where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church. For this is the peculiar name of this Holy Church, the mother of us all, which is the bride of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God." (Catechetical Lectures, XVIII.)

"It may be summed up that the word 'Catholic,' as descriptive of the Church, was used by the Fathers to denote the Church as being (1) universal in communion with the bishops, and (2) orthodox in communion with the bishops; and that the underlying thought of this description was explained as being that the Church was (1) the Church of the whole world; (2) the teacher of the whole truth; (3) the ruler of all classes of men; (4) the healer of all kinds of sins; (5) the conveyor of all kinds of virtue." (Stone, op. cit., p. 139.)

"Evidence is wanting to show that Irenaeus and Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine, understood the Catholic Church to mean the aggregate of the Churches which recognized the supremacy of Rome. The phrase came from the East, where the influence of the Roman Bishops was less directly felt than in Africa and Gaul; it was used by Western writers to comprehend the whole Christian brotherhood throughout the world; the earliest expositors of the Apostles' Creed manifest no desire to employ it as a vehicle for enforcing Roman claims. Under these circumstances it is unreasonable to prejudice the phrase by reading into it a tendency which it does not appear to have reflected until a much later age."

". . . the word 'Catholic' became after the second century a synonym for 'orthodox,' and the Catholic Church was limited to those Christian societies which were regarded as retaining the Apostles' faith. . . . The growth of heresy and the gradual separation of heretical minorities from the great body of the faithful, led to a secondary application of the word 'Catholic.' Catholics were contrasted with heretics, the Catholic Church with the sects which had parted from it. . . . As we proceed, the secondary sense becomes frequent 'Who are you?' the martyr Pionius was asked by the examining magistrate. 'A Christian.' 'Of what Church?' 'Of the Catholic Church' . . . St. Pacian (Bishop of Barcelona in the second half of the fourth century) when the Novatianists asked why he called himself a Catholic and was not content to be known as a Christian, replied, 'Christian is my name, Catholic my surname; the latter distinguishes me from others who bear the same name, but are not of the same family.' This limitation of the magnificent phrase of Ignatius was doubtless deplorable, but it was necessary. Everywhere in the third century there were Christians and Christians; the Churches which held to the Apostolic tradition were parted by an impassable gulf from the disciples of Valentinus and Basilides; yet the latter recognized the Gospels, and passed as members of Christ. But 'Catholics' they could not be called, for heresy was essentially partial and local, and limited to the few. . . .

"*Catholicam,* as understood in the fifth century, was exclusive as well as comprehensive; it embraced all Christian communities which held fast by the Apostolic doctrine and discipline, but shut the door against those who rejected either. Neither the Arian (akin to modern Unitarian and Congregationalist) nor the Donatist (the Puritans of the fourth and fifth centuries) could claim to belong to a Church which was defined as Catholic. 'Know,' writes Nicetas, 'that this one Catholic Church is planted in all the world, and be sure that you adhere steadfastly to her communion. There are, it is true, other Churches falsely so called, but you have nothing in common with them; heretical or schismatical bodies have ceased to be 'holy' Churches, for their faith and practice differ from that which Christ commanded and His Apostles delivered.

"The Protestant Churches of Germany," says Harnack, replaced 'Catholic' by 'Christian,' in their version of the Apostles' Creed. 'The Churches of the Reformation,' he says, 'could not consent to retain an epithet' which had received an interpretation foreign to her conceptions. As a matter of fact, one great 'Church of the Reformation' (The Church of England) retains it to this day. Our English Reformers ridiculed the absurdity of identifying the Catholic Church with a single branch of the Church. But their resistance to the Roman claims did not suggest to them the expediency of abandoning the term which had been thus abused. It remains in the English Prayer Book as a witness to the continuity of the Church of England with the Church of the early centuries. In the midst of the thousand divisions of Christendom it points to the organic unity of the true Body of Christ. Among the cries which proclaim the advent of an 'undenominational' and 'unsectarian' Christianity it witnesses to the preciousness of a definite faith". (Swete, *The Apostles' Creed.*)

"My name is Christian, my surname is Catholique. By one I am known from Infidels, by the other from Hereticks and Schismaticks."

"(Bramhall, *A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the unjust aspersions of Criminal Schisms:* 1654.")

Protestant.

History of the term "Protestant" in English Use. "The appellation of heresy was indignantly regarded by these men (viz. those who maintained that the 'liturgic reformation, the Scriptures in English included, should not be given up'); or amazed them, in adversaries not devoid of learning, like the outcry of fanatic ignorance. To be called heretics by that part of the Church who were for restoring all that had been before the twentieth year of Henry VIII, or by those who were for restoring only that theological platform which had been replaced in the last year of Henry, was bewildering to men who were accustomed to apply that term, and to see it applied, exclusively to opinions that were contrary to the Catholic faith, however defined; bewildering to Cranmer who had sat in commission on the Anabaptists, to Latimer who had approved of burning them, to Philpot who had spit upon an Arian. But as a mere retort it was not absolutely unjust, for Cranmer, in his *Reformatio Legum,* had numbered Transubstantiation among heretical opinions. As strongly they objected to the appropriation of the opposite term, Catholic, by their adversaries; having hitherto without the slightest hesitation spoken of themselves as Catholic and in the unity of the Church, and applied the exact, though odious, term papistical to the doctrines and practices in which they disagreed on the other side. The Latin Mass, as it was become, with the abuses of it now expressed as necessary, appeared to them a thing to be withstood at all risks. It appeared to them an absolute falsification of the true Catholic faith. Unfortunately in the heat of their contest with what they termed papistry, they adopted or accepted another designation which has been fruitful of widespread error, and has come to obscure their position, and has done more to confuse history, than almost any other application of terms that had place in the English Reformation. They called themselves, or let themselves be called, Protestant. The word was tempting in its literal meaning; but it was of foreign origin and history; it properly denoted the Lutherans, who had grown to be not Catholic in polity, being not Episcopal; who had fixed tenets, like consubstantiation, to which the English were as averse as they were to the fixed tenets which they called papistical. However, the word, Protestant, which, so far as I know, first began to be heard in England at the beginning of the late reign (Edward VI) was first used in relation to its proper opposite or contrary; and the resolute Bradford rebuked the compliant clergy who had excused themselves to the protestants for going to Mass with the papists. It retained its original and proper meaning in England (or a share of it) when in the next century it was used to denote the High Church or Laudian party in opposition to the puritans; but unhappily it passed into vogue at last as the opposite not of papist but of Catholic; in which abused sense it is now common to literature. This popular and literary misconception has reacted on the history of the Reformation with stupefying effect. The men who let themselves be called protestants, but were never weary of calling themselves Catholic, have been thought to be not Catholic because protestant. The opposite of Catholic is not protestant but heretic; the opposite of protestant is not Catholic but papist." (Dixon, History of the Church of England, IV, 220.)

"In our own days the term Protestant has been disowned for three reasons: that it is of foreign origin and history, that it is not found in the formularies of

the Church of England, and that it has been confidently adopted and taken to themselves by the great part of Modern Dissenters. A graver reason seems to be that it is improper to designate a Church by any term of limitation. It is so even when the term selected may belong to the definition of church, or of any or all churches; as when the Church of England is called episcopal, a part is given of her real definition, a part only of the whole. Much more is it improper when the term so selected is no part of the real definition; as, when, in the term, protestant, a constant description is applied to the Church of England, which declares no more than her accidental relation towards another Church and not her own properties, or essence, or any part thereof. This cramps theology, narrows teaching, and fosters false notions of history. (Dixon, op. cit., IV, 35.)

68410 (Hist.)
270.07R
J421
Jenks, A. W.
cop. 4
The use & abuse

270.07R
J421
cop. 4

68410